

capital out when the expatriates returned to their homelands.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., April 21, 1968]

DIPLOMATIC DEADLOCK OVER RHODESIA (By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The problem of racism in Rhodesia continues to bedevil chancelleries in much of the world. It torments the Commonwealth, stirs black Africa, and mocks hope for development of world order.

Well over two years ago, a small band of white Rhodesians, some five percent of the country's population, set out to defy the conscience and the organized economic power of the rest of the world. They have very largely succeeded.

UN diplomats are currently wrestling once again with ways to deal more effectively with the challenge. It is widely agreed that economic sanctions, now selective, should be made total, and that they should continue to be legally compulsory.

But suppose this is done—on paper. What then?

DISCREDIT U.N. FURTHER

South Africa and Portugal, which control key ports of entry and exit for Rhodesian supplies, have made perfectly clear they will continue to disregard UN directives. Zambia, which also has substantial Rhodesian trade, cannot obey these directives for long, and survive.

The result is that Rhodesia almost certainly will continue to fend off decisive damage. And the net effect of the crackdown will be to discredit still further the United Nations and the instrument on which it had hoped to rely in seeking peaceful change.

What to do?

Blockade the Portuguese colonial port of Lourenco Marques, Mozambique, through which a large part of the supplies flow?

There would be precedent for such action. Mozambique's other principal port, Beira, has been patrolled by British gunboats for two years to keep out oil tankers which had been feeding a Rhodesian pipeline.

But to shut both of Mozambique's ports completely, or subject them to an imposed rationing program, would be virtually an act of war against Portugal, Britain's oldest ally. The least it would be likely to do would be to drive Portugal out of NATO.

Send aircraft carriers to bomb the rail lines which carry supplies between Mozambi-

que and Rhodesia? Again a drastic step which would not help retain a Portuguese ally.

Close the South African loophole through which Rhodesia gets oil and other supplies? Far easier said than done.

South Africa has aircraft and naval vessels with which to challenge anything but a massive blockade. And in any event, neither Washington nor London would remotely consider a full-scale showdown with Pretoria at this stage.

Dry up Rhodesia's ultimate markets and sources of supply? This has been tried for two and one-half years, without notable success.

Send a British expeditionary force into Rhodesia? British opinion is deeply divided on the issue, and the Wilson government seems firmly opposed.

RHODESIA'S POSITION

Meanwhile hope of a mutually acceptable negotiated solution has all but vanished.

A Constitutional Commission in Rhodesia made clear once again this month that the only "compromise" the white minority will consider is one in which it is guaranteed permanent control.

The blacks could have a somewhat more influential political role, the Commission suggested, if they would give up any idea of ever ruling the country. But this a 95 percent majority is scarcely likely to do, and the rest of the world will not ask it to.

This is the kind of deadlock which drives men to violence.

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 14, 1968]

NEW U.S. STEPS AGAINST RHODESIA ARE UNDER STUDY

The United States is "quite prepared to consider further measures" against Rhodesia, which already is subject to sanctions, Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Palmer III said yesterday.

Palmer, who last week completed his second year as assistant secretary for African affairs, noted in an interview that further sanctions are under consideration by U.N. members in New York. On the U.S. position, he emphasized that careful consideration must be given not only to the scope of any further measures but also to their probable effectiveness.

U. S. officials estimate it will be at least two weeks before a U.N. Security Council vote is taken on measures against Rhodesia, which

unilaterally declared its independence from Britain on Nov. 11, 1965.

Palmer also expressed concern over an apparent "hardening of attitude" by South Africa, which he said was indicated by its attitude toward South West Africa, the terrorist trials and its noncooperation on sanctions against Rhodesia.

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., Apr. 19, 1968]

SIERRA LEONE COUP DETAILS REVEALED

FREETOWN, SIERRA LEONE.—First details of a coup by a group of army noncommissioned officers in this small West African state came this morning in a broadcast by someone who identified himself only as "Sergeant Major Rogers."

Sierra Leone had been cut off from the outside world since yesterday as reports from neighboring countries said the military regime of the National Reformation Council, headed by Brig. Andrew T. Juxon-Smith, had been ousted.

This morning's broadcast said Juxon-Smith had been arrested and a new 14-man council set up under the chairmanship of Warrant Officer Patrick Conteh. Sgt. Maj. Rogers said all diplomatic missions should carry on as normal and "have no fear."

Deputy Chairman William Leigh of the council and other senior army and police officers had also been arrested, Rogers said, accusing council members of having practiced "nepotism and corruption" since taking over 14 months ago.

"Our immediate aim is to return to civilian rule," he declared, adding that the Council has been dissolved.

The new regime, styled the "Anticorruption Revolutionary Movement," announced last night formation of a seven-man national interim council of four army and three police officers whose primary task would be to work out a peaceful return to civilian rule within the "shortest possible time."

The movement also announced the recall of Col. John Bangura, currently counselor in the Sierra Leone Embassy in Washington, and Lt. Col. Ambrose Genda, ambassador to Liberia, to serve as military commanders.

About 40 senior army and police officers have been arrested and a dusk-to-dawn curfew is in force, although conditions were reported almost back to normal today.

Despite official announcements that the coup was bloodless, at least two persons were reported killed and about six wounded.

SENATE—Tuesday, April 23, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Bernie Smith, D.D., minister of the Fellowship Chapel, Hamilton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, hear our prayer. In a world that is divided and appalling, we are united and appealing unto Thee. Grant Thy favor to these who assume a vital role in the healing of a wounded world.

We thank Thee for our flag with the 50 stars of hope that shine in its firmament, and we know that every star proclaims our faith in Jehovah who guides the destiny of our people.

In an hour that recites the alphabet of death—teach us the language of life.

In an hour that invites compromise—teach us that life must be governed by principle and not by policy.

CXIV—647—Part 8

In an hour that is filled with the love of power—teach us the power of love.

In an hour when there are those who would offer men the glass crutch of bondage—teach us that we must give ourselves on the altar of service that men may learn the right and restraint of liberty.

In an hour when trouble spots like measles break out on every hand, and the dreadful cancer of division is eating at the vitals of an uncertain generation—teach us that time hastens without consent and must not leave us emptyhanded. Yea, help us to rebuild our spiritual arsenal and learn the value of the weapons of prayer and faith.

Take all that we are and all that we may yet become and use us in some measure that there will yet come a day when there is peace on earth and good will among men.

We ask not that our epitaph shall declare that we were great—but may it say that we have served.

Guide Thou the ship of state, O God. We fear not the angry waves when Thou art at the helm. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 22, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

REPORT ON SPECIAL INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the Fifth Annual Report on Special International Exhibitions conducted during Fiscal Year 1967 under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

These exhibitions help tell the story of America.

They enable America's economic, social and cultural achievements to be exhibited at leading international fairs and in other priority locations. They help build bridges of understanding between the United States and other countries.

Each exhibition shows how American accomplishments relate to the interests and capabilities of the host countries. Because these National Pavilions feature equipment and products of American industries, they also contribute to mutually profitable trade relationships.

Nearly 110 million people—primarily in Eastern Europe and the developing countries—have visited more than 190 of these exhibitions since this program began in 1954.

The following exhibitions were presented during the fiscal year 1967 period:

Trade Fair Exhibitions in Bulgaria, France, Ghana, Hungary, Poland, Thailand, the USSR, Yugoslavia, and West Berlin covered a wide range of subjects in the fields of agriculture, industry, science, education, and space exploration.

"Expo 67", in Montreal, highlighted the United States Pavilion with its theme "Creative America." Daily attendance from opening day on April 28, 1967, until June 30, 1967 averaged 55,000 visitors.

Special "East-West" Exhibitions on "Hand Tools—USA" and "Industrial Design—USA" were shown in Moscow and five other cities of the USSR to an audience of more than one and a half million people.

Labor Missions and Exhibits, presented by the Department of Labor at trade fairs in Hungary, Poland, Thailand, and Yugoslavia portrayed aspects of the American labor scene to priority audiences.

Trade Missions were organized by the Department of Commerce in twelve countries of Africa, Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East.

As in previous years, hundreds of private American firms contributed machines, products, company executives, and technicians to assist in carrying out this program.

All Americans are indebted to them for their help in conveying a better understanding of America to peoples of other nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1968.

REPORT ON INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit to the Congress this report on our international cultural and educational exchange programs during fiscal year 1967, as required by law.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1968.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 16409) to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1965 to provide salary increases for teachers and school officers in the District of Columbia public schools, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on Government Research of the Committee on Government Operations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A MUTUALLY SATISFACTORY SUITABLE SITE FOR NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on March 31, the President, in his extraordinary speech of renunciation, made the following statement:

I have asked Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson, who returned from Moscow for consultation, to be available to join Ambassador Harriman at Geneva or—

And I emphasize the rest of this sentence—

any other suitable place—just as soon as Hanoi agrees to a conference.

The President then called upon President Ho Chi Minh to "respond positively, and favorably, to this new step toward peace." A few days later, President Ho Chi Minh did respond favorably and indicated that he was prepared to establish contact at Pnompenh or a "mutually agreeable" site.

As I interpret the President's statement, he was prepared to send a representative of this country to either "Geneva or any other suitable place"; and Ho Chi Minh, in response, was prepared to send a representative of North Vietnam to Pnompenh or "any other mutually agreeable" site.

It appears to me that there has been too much quibbling and not enough understanding as to what both the President and Ho Chi Minh said. Certainly, there should be little disagreement between a suitable place, as the President stated, or a mutually agreeable site, as Ho Chi Minh stated, for the purpose of getting together and establishing contact.

This initial contact, at a mutually agreeable or suitable site, would be for the purpose of then deciding where a conference would be held for the purpose of entering into negotiations and, hopefully, reaching an honorable settlement.

The President is sincere in his offer. I would assume that Ho Chi Minh is, too; and I would hope, therefore, that whatever propaganda value has been achieved, it would now be put on the back burner and that the two countries would get down to business, arrive at an agreement covering a "suitable mutually agreeable place, to the end that the initial contact be established.

With more than 3 weeks gone by since the President made his initial offer and almost 3 weeks since Ho Chi Minh responded favorably, it would appear to me that the time for public exchanges over this question is past. Therefore, either through direct meetings or through third parties, and in private, the time has arrived to get down to bedrock and to reach an agreement on a "mutually satisfactory suitable" site to establish the first contacts. This is the important factor now, and the ultimate decision on this first small step is of the greatest significance and the most profound importance if a site for a conference is to be selected, a conference is to be held, and negotiations gotten underway.

Charges of insincerity have been directed against both sides. I would hope that the sincerity of the President in endeavoring to establish a contact would be matched by the same degree of sincerity on the part of Ho Chi Minh.

The language to be considered, in my opinion, is not the language of the past but the language of the present—to wit, the President's proposal in his speech of

March 31 and Ho Chi Minh's reply of April 3. It is time to have the matter of contacts settled so that once this is done, the most serious business of finding ways and means to the conference table and to honorably end the Vietnam conflict can be undertaken.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THOMAS W. PEW, JR., OUTSTANDING OHIO EDITOR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in January 1968, R. George Kuser, Jr., publisher of the Troy Daily News, a leading newspaper circulating in Troy, Ohio, and throughout the rural area of western Ohio with a large circulation in Miami County and cities and towns in western Ohio, asked his editor, Thomas W. Pew, Jr., to go to Vietnam and report on the war we are waging in Southeast Asia. Tom Pew went there and spent more than a month in Saigon and elsewhere in South Vietnam reporting on the war and on Troy area men in the war zone. In all likelihood Tom Pew was the only editor of a newspaper of comparable size to have reported the Vietnam war for as long a time and in such depth.

He spent 33 days in Vietnam and filed at least one story a day, and sometimes two. His series of articles certainly rank among the finest examples of newspaper coverage of our involvement in the ugly civil war in Vietnam which, under the leadership on President Johnson, has been turned into an American air and ground war. It is unfortunate that these articles were not reprinted in major metropolitan newspapers throughout the country.

Tom Pew, Jr., clearly and concisely pointed out that our involvement in the Vietnam war has been the worst mistake ever made in our Nation's history; that we are losing the war militarily, and that it is the wrong war at the wrong time in the wrong place.

Mr. President, I believe that the final article written by Tom Pew on his Vietnam assignment entitled "Message From Vietnam" most succinctly sets forth his conclusions. I ask unanimous consent that this article which appeared in the Troy Daily News on February 24, 1968, as well as two other outstanding articles written by Tom Pew entitled "Four Brave Congressmen" and "Vietcong Territory" which appeared in that newspaper on February 12 and February 21, respectively, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE FROM VIETNAM

(By Tom Pew)

It's our turn to thank the readers.

Now the final story and the last picture page gathered in Vietnam has been published we want to tell the many relatives of Miami County men at war how much we appreciate their making our trip possible by providing us with the soldiers' names.

It is our hope that the eyewitness accounts told by these young men will help cut away the veil of official distortions about both the conduct of the war and its progress on the battlefield.

Never before has the United States indulged in a more misguided exploit than it does today in Vietnam.

Never before has the United States found itself being stalemated by a braver (and respected by the men in the field) enemy.

The sum of this immorality and military stupidity is that Miami County men are risking their lives and dying in a poor Asian country where they are not wanted; in a war they should not have to be fighting; for a corrupt government Washington helped to power through suspect elections.

Several of the Miami County men, as reported in their own words in the past month, have open reservations about their country's commitment; others, who express agreement with the commitment, belie their own conviction with bold questions.

This questioning and this lack of conviction on the part of many Miami County men is taking place in spite of the pressures of military life to conform to a rigid credo.

They are put in a double-bind by their feeling, on the one hand, that it is unpatriotic to oppose their country when they are serving in its army, but on the other hand they cannot deny the guide of their consciences.

Some have ceased to question and have gradually accepted the ways of brutality, even to the extent of participating in the horrible crimes of this war. These men are forever changed by their actions; they are overwhelmed and blighted by what they've seen; by what they've done.

As difficult as it is to accept, it is nevertheless true that Americans (Miami County men included) are guilty of the same type of crimes this country is so quick to accuse the Viet Cong of.

We have seen Miami County men openly and without provocation deeply insult South Vietnamese. In the case called to mind the Vietnamese was an individual who had fled from the north in 1965, leaving everything to seek a better life in the south.

Another Miami County man admitted that he had fired on a group of houses and burned them down when he wasn't certain that they belonged to Viet Cong. He admitted: "Innocent people are sometimes killed."

Fortunately, we don't have to report that it was a Miami County man (but an American GI nevertheless) who bragged to this writer about taking a part in annihilating a whole village. This man, if he still deserves that name, boasted laughingly: "They were pacified for sure when we got through with them." Maybe some of them were Viet Cong—maybe.

Reporting these facts to the readers is not a task we have looked forward to—so we have left it till last—but it is a part of the message from Miami County men in Vietnam and it is an important part.

It is not enough to dismiss these incidents and doubts as just unfortunately isolated side affects of war. They are not isolated and they are occurring daily in a war that is being perpetuated at home with lies and both official and public hypocrisy.

The war in Vietnam is a war we should not be fighting. And even among people who do not agree with this opinion we find a strong seed of doubt.

To continue fighting as a soldier, and to

continue supporting a war as a civilian when one is not convinced of its justice is to harden the spirit against truth and compassion.

An America that does not at least strive to conduct itself on principals of truthfulness and compassion will soon be—if it is not already—under the leadership of men as evil as those we have so frequently opposed.

FOUR BRAVE CONGRESSMEN

(By Tom Pew)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—As of the writing of this editorial (February 7) Tom Pew was still in Saigon, caught in the battle for that city and unable to leave at the end of his 30 day tour to interview Miami County men at war. But he was able to leave over the weekend and is on his way back to the U.S.)

SAIGON.—It came as something of a bewildering shock to curfew-restricted Americans in Saigon to read a UPI story that began as follows:

"Four U.S. Congressmen who spent three hours in Saigon Tuesday afternoon said they were extremely optimistic about the favorable outcome of the current fighting in the cities of South Vietnam."

Without any intentional irony the story which appeared in the English language Saigon Daily News went on to say: "Tan Son Nhut air base (was) the only place they were able to visit on the ground while in South Vietnam."

This however did not discourage them from proclaiming (reported by UPI) "that destruction in Saigon did not appear, from the air, to be as bad as reports from the city indicated it was. This last bit of observation makes one wonder just where the Congressmen's military escorts flew them. At the last count the refugee figure for Saigon alone was at 58,000 and still climbing and estimated to double or triple when all the reports are in."

The four brave congressmen who made the three hour fact finding touchdown at Tan Son Nhut are Reps. Frank Clark (D-Pa.), Don H. Clausen (R-Calif.), James S. Cleveland (R-N.H.) and William C. Cramer (R-Fla.). All four are members of the House Public Works Committee and their junketeering had taken them to Sydney, Australia for an International Road Conference before they visited Bangkok, leaving only three hours for their trip to Vietnam.

Maybe if the four Congressmen had gotten their feet on the ground they would have seen first hand why the Pacific Stars and Stripes reported:

"Large sections of Saigon and Hue lay in smoldering ruins and towering columns of smoke shot up through the sunny sky as South Vietnamese dive-bombers, U.S. helicopter gunships, artillery and tanks blasted away at Communist troops in scattered sections."

If they had stayed more than a few hours in the city perhaps they would have learned of the food shortage and other serious threats to public health, again reported in the authorized publication of the armed forces in the far east as follows:

"Ever-growing garbage heaps remained on the streets throughout Saigon—a city already heavily infested by rats."

"U.S. officials said the Vietnamese government was giving mass inoculations in an effort to avoid a plague epidemic . . ."

"And there were also reports that bodies were still decaying in the streets in some sections of the city in the wake of the Communist drive that began a week ago. Most of Saigon's hospitals are badly overcrowded."

As the fighting continued the hundreds of American civilian employees living in the city and who work in civic action programs were still unable to return to their offices for security reasons and those of us who wanted to fly out of the country were unable to move because the airport remained closed to commercial traffic. It has remained

closed because it is not safe to fly over the countryside in that vicinity.

With all respect for the Congressmen's high optimism, the Communist attack disrupted and continues to disrupt the ponderous American military and civil action machine in Vietnam.

It has created hundreds of thousands of new refugees that we are pledged to care for.

It has proven that the Communists here are capable of launching simultaneous attacks on every city in South Vietnam and that regardless of their heavy losses they are capable of attacking and still holding in reserve enough men so that another attack could be launched immediately.

It might have been hoped that the Communist Tet offensive would remove the wool from the eyes of American political optimists. Unfortunately the effect appears to be just the opposite.

Hopefully the voters will not be so naive or dishonest with themselves as these four Congressmen have been. The war in Vietnam is not being won by America. It is, at best, only being held at a painful stalemate.

If the United States is to win here (if that is even possible in the terms we are accustomed to) then it must be prepared to continue fighting for at least another ten years or it must resort to the questionable advantage of using nuclear weapons.

If the voters want to continue this action then they must be realistic about the time and the sacrifice. The time is long; the sacrifice is thousands of men just like the fine men of Miami County we have interviewed here in the past month.

VIETCONG TERRITORY

(By Tom Pew)

The attack today on Saigon must remind Americans who followed the Tet Communist offensive that there is no part of Vietnam—south as well as north—that is not Viet Cong territory.

The VC are free to move about the country at will to enter and leave the cities when they choose and even to slip in and out of American bases when the venture is worth their while.

On at least two occasions GIs told us of sapper attacks where the Viet Cong came directly into a heavily guarded American compound, planted satchel charges and then retreated, leaving behind blasted buildings and disabled helicopters.

On both of these occasions (at Chu Lai and Cam Ranh Bay) the Americans in the compound never knew how many of the enemy were in the compound, never saw them and were unable to do anything to stop them.

The two nights we visited the base at An Khe (story on page one) the Viet Cong came under the wire and while their fellow communists mortared the post from the outside they went about their work inside. On this occasion some of the VC were caught, killed, and lost their ears to angry GIs, but not before they had done the damage that was their mission.

On a bigger level, the infiltration and subsequent attack on Saigon, Hue and the other cities of S. Vietnam took place (and is taking place) right under the noses of the highest American command. Even General Westmoreland's command headquarters outside of Tan Son Nhut came under direct attack and he had to move to a center room until desperate and embarrassed defenders drove the enemy back.

We won't even mention the American Embassy.

The truth about Vietnam is that the country belongs to the Viet Cong and that our presence there, as massive and powerful as it is, is vulnerable to attack on their terms.

The truth is, and Americans in Vietnam admit it even if officials in Washington don't, the Viet Cong could be killing many more

Americans than they do with little danger to themselves.

There are hundreds of Americans working in Saigon who could be assassinated not to mention hundreds of more who are working in the countryside who are spared by the Viet Cong merely because they feel it is not worth their while to kill them. Newsmen, construction workers, and dock workers can be added to the list of those the VC spare.

To describe the extent of their command of the countryside we are reminded of a remark made to us by a high refugee official. He said: "We in the country are completely in the hands of the Viet Cong. If they choose to target us tomorrow then we are dead. If they choose to leave us alone then we are free to go about our work."

This man had once found himself isolated in an outlying village when a squad of VC came into the community. "I stepped out of the hut," he said, "and they looked at me and I looked at them. Then I got in my truck and drove away."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GREEN RIVER BELOW FLAMING GORGE DAM PRODUCES TOP TROUT IN UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the April issue of Outdoor Life magazine carries a statement which tells how good the fishing is in the northeastern corner of my State of Utah. Don Brooks, outdoor editor of the Salt Lake Tribune, names the Green River below Flaming Gorge Dam as his first choice for Utah's fishing opener which will occur Saturday, June 1.

Mr. Brooks notes that prior to the dam's construction a few years ago, all one could catch in the Green River were carp and squawfish. Now, he says, the Green below the dam is one of Utah's top trout producers.

Because we who are particularly interested in water development must undergo frequent criticism as to the adverse effects which dam building sometimes has on fisheries, it is particularly refreshing to call to the attention of the Senate this case—which is only one of many—in which a dam has made it possible to improve sport fishing enormously.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Brooks' short statement from Outdoor Life.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Outdoor Life, April 1968]

A DAM DID IT

I won't be there, darn it, but if I had my druthers on Utah's fishing opener (Sat-

day, June 1), I'd fish The River That Didn't Used To Be.

I mean the Green River below Flaming Gorge Dam in northeastern Utah. Prior to the dam's construction a few years ago, all you could catch in the Green River were carp and squawfish. Now the Green below the dam is one of Utah's top trout producers.

A stretch of about 30 miles, from the dam to the Colorado border, is usually very clear. The upper 14 miles, from the dam down to Red Creek, is always clear, but sometimes summer showers can cause sediment farther downstream.

You can fish this blue-ribbon water two ways—by hiking leisurely along its banks or by floating it. Present regulations prohibit the use of motors on rafts or boats on the stretch from the dam to Red Creek. Motors may be used below Red Creek.

A favorite method of many anglers, including me, is to use weighted wet flies, on ultralight spinning outfits. I have found the black streamer patterns to be certain fish-takers on most days.

Small spinning lures also are good. Take along several color combinations of all lures, though, because what catches fish one day may not work the next.

Here's an example of this stream's productivity. A Utah fish-and-game official, a good angler, walked downstream from the dam late last October. Fishing with dark wet flies on a spinning outfit, he caught and released 44 trout ranging up to 20 inches in a 2½-mile stretch.

The country through which the Green flows is some of Utah's most scenic. The river dashes through a steep canyon until it reaches the Red Creek sector, where the terrain flattens out.

A word of caution for the foot fisherman: be alert at all times. The flow of the river can fluctuate rapidly as gates at the dam are opened or closed.—Don Brooks, Outdoor Editor, Salt Lake City (Utah) Tribune.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, so many times have the words "fiscal responsibility" been heard in this Chamber in the last decade that it would be impossible to count them.

Prior to the Easter recess, the Senate matched deeds to those words when it attached to a House bill the 10-percent surcharge and a ceiling on Federal expenditures which would cut \$6 billion from fiscal 1969 spending.

Recent developments greatly strengthen the case for our action. The Federal Reserve Board has raised the rediscount rate; inflation continues at an unacceptable pace; our ability to sustain the value of the dollar remains in doubt.

In last Thursday's Evening Star, John Cuniff discussed the record \$20 billion growth of the American economy in the first quarter of this year. He said that \$8 billion of that growth was inflation.

He said:

Nevertheless, the \$12 billion real growth still was enormous by any measure. It was bigger than the entire economy of Norway or Austria or Venezuela. And it came on top of a record long expansion of the American economy.

A few paragraphs later, Mr. Cuniff said:

The surplus in foreign trade was off, a condition that cannot be permitted to continue for long without confidence in the dollar deteriorating even more.

There is a close connection between the pace of domestic activity and imports.

When the economy moves ahead as fast as it has since the middle of last year, imports rise sharply. Between January and February of this year, our merchandise imports rose by roughly 20 percent. Over that same period exports rose by only 8 percent. There are some special factors, such as extra imports because of the copper strike, but a major reason for the recent shrinkage in our trade surplus has been the rapid advance of the domestic economy.

Rates of unemployment for adult males are as low as at any time since Korea. With the labor situation so tight, consumer spending sets wages and prices to chasing one another. In this race, there are few winners and many losers. If the inflationary process were to get entirely out of hand, only very drastic measures could control the situation. It is far wiser to act now—applying a moderate amount of fiscal restraint—than to take radical measures later.

Only fiscal restraint can bring our domestic finances into better order and reduce the risk of a further damaging credit crunch. Without a tax increase, the January budget implies a budget deficit, on the new unified basis, of more than \$22 billion in the current fiscal year, and \$20 billion in fiscal 1969. Back-to-back budget deficits totaling more than \$40 billion are incompatible with fiscal responsibility and would seriously overstrain our financial markets.

In my opinion, fiscal action close to that already approved by the Senate must be taken, and taken promptly. Further delay merely increases the risk that harsher restraints will have to be applied eventually.

In 1967, monetary policy was relatively expansionary through most of the year. Since last fall, however, monetary policy has been pointed in a restraining direction and has culminated in the rise in the rediscount rate. This was perhaps inevitable given the balance-of-payments and international financial situations. We now face the prospect of heavy Federal borrowing and rising private demands for credit at the very time that the monetary authorities are putting on the brakes. That could add up to 1966-style conditions in the credit markets and another sharp blow to the housing industry. Interest rates were already at historically high levels. An extremely disruptive effect on the flow of credit may result from the latest increase.

The cure for our present difficulties is restraint in Federal expenditures and a temporary increase in income taxes. The reduction in the Federal budget deficit would take some of the steam out of the current boom, slow the sharp rise in our imports, and reduce the congestion in our financial markets.

But even if we are not successful in cutting several billion dollars from current spending, our balance of payments and pressure on the dollar make it necessary to enact the tax increase. I say this as one who enthusiastically supported the tax reductions of former years. Experience has shown that we were wise to make those reductions. The stated purposes of the cuts were realized. Now conditions have changed. It is already late to be applying corrective tax action to today's situation. Just as it was desirable

to reduce taxes to stimulate business expansion, now it is imperative to raise taxes to check inflation.

Essential demands on the Federal budget will remain high. Development and conservation of resources, abatement of pollution, education, improved law enforcement, alleviation of some of the underlying conditions which inflame the ghetto population—these and many other programs must be funded, not to mention the massive needs of national defense.

Anyone who has read the newspapers the last few days is aware of the mounting concern lest the dollar cannot be sustained through current fiscal policy.

In yesterday's Washington Post, Joseph R. Selvin, writing from Paris, warned that the answer to whether the United States will "make or break" the new free gold market will not be long in coming. Selvin said:

Some European financial experts measure the testing period in weeks. Others figure it in months. But all agree that there will be a fresh run on gold and renewed speculative raids on the dollar unless the U.S. produces clear-cut evidence that it is starting to trim its multi-billion dollar balance of payments deficit.

On the same page, Hobart Rowan, although distressed at the vehemence of Chairman William McChesney Martin's statement on Friday, emphasized that a tax increase is one thing indicated by the present situation.

A few days before, Marquis Childs' Post column raised the question, whether more Federal expenditures in some programs were indicated by the riots which followed the murder of Martin Luther King, Jr. Mr. Childs expressed discouragement at the deep division in Congress over "taxes versus full employment in a free economy," which, he believes, has contributed to the long delay over enactment of an income tax surcharge. He concluded with this warning:

And if fragile confidence in the dollar goes up in smoke America's economy would not be immune from the consequences.

Mr. President, it surely must be clear by now that if the dollar is to remain strong—at home and abroad—our national finances must be placed on a sounder basis. I urge the conferees considering the excise tax bill to act promptly, and to report a bill which includes the Senate 10-percent surtax amendment.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration by the Senate of the nomination of W. Marvin Watson, of Texas, to be Postmaster General, which I report unanimously from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The BILL CLERK. W. Marvin Watson, of Texas, to be Postmaster General of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this nomination was reported this morning by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

During my 18 years of service on this outstanding committee, I have never heard a nominee come before it for confirmation and receive the encomiums of praise and appreciation for distinguished Government service that were given to the present nominee for Postmaster General, the Honorable W. Marvin Watson, of Texas.

Mr. President, I shall not burden the RECORD with the well-known story of his outstanding service as a Government servant and righthand man of President Lyndon B. Johnson for nearly 3½ years, a man who has considered most of the appointees who have been chosen by the President during that 3½ years, and a man who has had so much valuable experience in business as an executive of one of the larger industrial plants of his home State of Texas.

I know that the Senate is interested in voting on this distinguished nominee. Let me say that there were no party line divisions.

Now I should like to yield at this time to the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and senior member of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in yielding to me on this occasion.

Speaking of the minority, let me state that we were not only unanimous on our side in support of the nominee of the President for Postmaster General, W. Marvin Watson, of Texas, but we also all expressed our views regarding his excellent background and service for this position.

Personally, on being advised by the White House of Marvin Watson's nomination, that I not only approved it but was confident that it was most acceptable to me and would be to the country.

We not only wish him well; we are confident that the Post Office Department will be in good hands.

As I stated at the hearing this morning, it has been my privilege to serve with such distinguished Postmasters General as Mr. Jim Farley, Mr. Bob Hannegan, of Missouri, Mr. Donaldson, Mr. Arthur Summerfield, and Mr. Larry O'Brien. They have all been great Postmasters General. I am confident that Mr. Marvin Watson will also be a great Postmaster General and that much progress will be made under his leadership.

It was my pleasure to be present with the distinguished chairman and other members of the committee when the committee voted unanimously for the nomination.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak on the

matter, I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROCUREMENT FROM SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Department of Defense Procurement from small and other business firms for July 1967-February 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Maritime Administration for the fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL REVENUES FOR HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional revenue for the highway trust fund, to extend the duration of the highway trust fund, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR IMPLEMENTING CONVENTIONS FOR FREE ADMISSION OF PROFESSIONAL EQUIPMENT AND CONTAINERS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for implementing Conventions for Free Admission of Professional Equipment and Containers, and for ATA, ECS and TIR Carnets (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED INCREASE PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF PAYMENTS ON SURPLUS PROPERTY CREDIT ACCOUNTS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of payments on surplus property credit accounts during the calendar year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Bonneville Power Administration for the fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COURT REPORTERS SALARIES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e) to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF EXTRAORDINARY CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS TO FACILITATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Installations and Logistics, transmitting a report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense for the calendar year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED ADMISSION TO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN INHABITANTS OF THE BONIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the admission to the United States of certain inhabitants of the Bonin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THIRD PREFERENCE AND SIXTH PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Mr. Shiu Gee Chan from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on February 1, 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF ADVISORY COUNCIL ON STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third annual report of the Advisory Council on State Departments of Education, dated March 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1968

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 65

"Whereas, Hawaii and Alaska, the newest States in the Union, may be able to develop

strong commercial ties with each other if there are certain amendments made to the Merchant Marine Act of 1920; and

"Whereas, there is now pending in the Congress of the United States two bills, H.R. 13093 and S. 2454, which would amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 to allow the direct shipment of goods between Hawaii and Alaska on foreign vessels; and

"Whereas, it is possible trade could be developed from Alaska in such products as petroleum products, lumber, fertilizer and seafood; and from Hawaii such products as sugar, pineapple and other tropical fruits, fresh vegetables, and beef; and

"Whereas, there is an urgent need to encourage freer trade and all possible action which will bring down the high cost of living in the State of Hawaii; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Fourth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Budget Session of 1968, that the House of Representatives support passage of H.R. 13093 and S. 2454 in the United States Congress in order to encourage trade between Alaska and Hawaii; and

"Be it further resolved that duly certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice-President of the United States; Senators Daniel K. Inouye, Hawaii, Hiram L. Fong, Hawaii, Ernest Gruening, Alaska, E. L. Bartlett, Alaska, Warren G. Magnuson, Washington, Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; Representatives Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii, Patsy T. Mink, Hawaii, Howard W. Pollock, Alaska; Governors Walter J. Hickel of Alaska and John A. Burns of Hawaii; the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska; the U.S. Secretary of Commerce; the U.S. Secretary of the Interior; the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission; and to Ross D. Davis, Assistant Secretary for Economic Development.

"Attest:

"TADAO BEPPU,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"SHIGETO KANEMOTO,

"Clerk, House of Representatives."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 105

"Resolution requesting Congress to develop a method of Federal financing and establish guidelines for State and local subdivisions to follow in expansion of airports to cope with the fast developing air industry

"Whereas, The fast growth of air traffic is putting a strain on metropolitan airports even before the expected arrival in the 1970's of the jumbo jets and supersonic airliners; and

"Whereas, The Federal government has a responsibility to help state and local governments in the planning, construction, development and improvement of the nation's airports; and

"Whereas, There should be a common agreement reached in the near future on the ways to achieve better utilization of existing airport facilities and to finance the development and construction of a national airport system adequate to meet the needs of commercial and general aviation in the next decade, in order to avert an impending crisis of safety and convenience at the nation's airports; and

"Whereas, The crisis and challenge facing aviation today can only be met by launching immediately a massive construction program to build new and safer airports for airline passengers and general aviation; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That Congress be urged to develop

a method of Federal financing for airports and to establish guidelines for State and local subdivisions to follow in the expansion of airports to cope with the fast developing air industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the United States Senators from Maryland, and the Maryland Congressional Delegation."

"MARVIN MANDEL,
"Speaker of the House."
"JAMES P. MAUSE,
"Chief Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 3

"Joint resolution relative to establishment of an insurance fund for offshore oil leasing

"Whereas, The United States Department of the Interior has leased certain lands situated offshore of the State of California outside of the three-mile limit for offshore oil operations; and

"Whereas, The shoreline along the California coast is one of the state's magnificent heritages, a scene of unrivaled natural beauty; and

"Whereas, Any leakage contamination, or beach pollution emanating from such oil operations, whether caused by negligence of man or forces of nature, or any other cause, could cause great damage to the valuable shoreline areas; and

"Whereas, The public interest would be well served through creation of an insurance fund for the protection and preservation of the California shoreline; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to establish an insurance fund from revenue produced through offshore oil development and production, to be used for removal of pollution, contamination, or debris resulting from such development and operations which affect the California shoreline and for the compensation of landowners, including public agencies, for private or public property damage; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of the Interior."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 11

"Senate resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to liberalize the stringent provisions of the Hatch Act

"Whereas, Employees of the Federal Government are now restricted under the 'Hatch Act' from participating in partisan politics; and

"Whereas, The Commission on Political Activities of Government Employees has issued its report to the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas, the Commission's report makes certain concrete recommendations for revision of the 'Hatch Act'; and

"Whereas, It is the desire of the Federal employees to participate actively in their local government; and

"Whereas, This untapped reservoir of talented employees should be allowed to participate in the affairs of their local government; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That

the Congress of the United States be asked to pass appropriate legislation based on the Commission's recommendations with a view to liberalizing the stringent provisions of the Hatch Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Maryland Delegation to the United States Senate and the House of Representatives, to the Chairman, Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., and to the National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., and the National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C."

"WILLIAM S. JAMES,
"President of the Senate."
"J. WATERS PARRISH,
"Secretary of the Senate."

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 2017. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into contracts for the inspection, maintenance, and repair of fixed equipment in District-owned buildings for periods not to exceed 3 years (Rept. No. 1093).

DEFINITION AND REGULATION OF THE PRACTICE OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1092)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I ask unanimous consent that I may report from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment to the bill (S. 1864) to define and regulate the practice of psychology in the District of Columbia, and I submit a report thereon and ask that the report be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3355. A bill for the relief of Dr. Emilio Ambrosio Trujillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3356. A bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Theodore Daniel Van Staveren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 3357. A bill for the relief of Jim B Ko, Sui Chung Man, Kwai Chong, Sui Yuen Yuen; and

S. 3358. A bill for the relief of Jack Sepilian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 3359. A bill to authorize the mortgaging of tribal lands on the Fort Berthold Reservation for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK (for himself and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 3360. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Arvel Glinz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 3361. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Vassallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 3362. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ismail Mohammad Jassim, his wife, Dr. Cecile Ibrahim Jassim, and their daughter, Sana R. Jassim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself and Mr. PELL):

S. 3363. A bill to designate the U.S. Customs House Building in Providence, R.I., as the "John E. Fogarty Building"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 3364. A bill for the relief of Phil Ho Oh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGEE:

S. 3365. A bill for the relief of Anka Zduniec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3366. A bill authorizing a survey of Burnett, Crystal and Scotts Bays and vicinity, Baytown, Tex., for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works. (See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 3367. A bill to provide for the construction of a certain memorial along the route of the Lewis and Clark Expedition in North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S.J. Res. 162. A joint resolution to authorize the President to provide assistance to the University of North Africa Association in the establishment and operation of a nonprofit university near Tangier, Morocco; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 3356—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO CONFER U.S. CITIZENSHIP POSTHUMOUSLY UPON PFC. THEODORE DANIEL VAN STAVEREN

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the other day I learned of the death of Pfc. Theodore Daniel Van Staveren, U.S. Marine Corps. He was a constituent of mine from Salt Lake City, and was killed in battle just 13 days ago in Vietnam.

Little Theo Van Staveren came to the United States from Holland in 1954 with his parents, two brothers, and a sister. And on February 24 of last year he joined the Marine Corps, without yet having become a citizen of this country.

Several months ago, Theo's mother wrote to me and explained that her son would like to become a citizen before he went to Vietnam. And I was informed by the Marine Corps that he would be authorized special liberty for this purpose. It was not until just recently, however, that I learned he did not have enough money to travel from Camp Pendleton, Calif., to the immigration office in San Diego. Therefore, he could not apply for citizenship.

Theodore Van Staveren has now given his life for his adopted country, Mr. President. But this country has not yet been given the opportunity to adopt him. So at this time I wish to introduce a private bill to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Theodore Daniel Van Staveren. We can do no less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill

will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3356) to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Pfc. Theodore Daniel Van Staveren, introduced by Mr. Moss, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3366—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AUTHORIZE FLOOD CONTROL SURVEY AT BAYTOWN, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise to introduce a bill to authorize a survey of Burnett, Crystal, and Scott Bays and vicinity, Baytown, Tex., for flood control and other purposes.

The problem arises from extensive subsidence of the land level of this entire area, due to extensive withdrawals of ground water for municipal and industrial uses during the last 50 years. This subsidence has caused flooding problems and a study was made of a possible flood control project. This study was financed by contributions voluntarily made by individuals, families, business and community civic organizations.

After forwarding the concept study to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, I received a letter from Lt. Col. William R. Needham, Assistant Director of Civil Works for Plains Divisions, which I would like printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 11, 1968.

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: This is in reply to your recent letter inclosing a concept study of a potential levee project in the upper reaches of Galveston Bay in the vicinity of Baytown.

The problem of concern in the concept study results from extensive subsidence of the entire area in and around Burnett, Crystal, and Scotts Bays attributed to extensive withdrawals of ground water for municipal and industrial uses during the last 50 years or more. This pumping has resulted in lowering the water table in the underlying aquifers from a level near the ground surface in the early 1900's to about 250 feet below the surface at the present time. The underlying formation consists of a series of sand and clay strata and possibly the removal of water has resulted in compression of this strata and surface subsidence.

Subsidence affects an extensive part of metropolitan Houston, with the principal subsidence cone centered near the San Jacinto monument, across the Houston Ship Channel west of Baytown. The maximum subsidence in this area is on the order of 5 to 6 feet at the present time.

The Corps of Engineers has been aware of this problem for several years and the Baytown area has been the subject of considerable investigation in the Texas Coast Hurricane study being conducted by our Galveston District Engineer. The protection being considered in these studies includes a system of primary protective structures at or near the coast, with secondary protective structures, where necessary, to protect communities along the shores of coastal bays from hurricane surges developed within the bays. It appears that, even with a primary system at the coast, the Baytown area would require secondary protection. However, it will be several years before the feasibility

of potential improvements for protection of the Galveston Bay area has been determined, and those works found economically justified have been recommended and authorized by Congress for construction.

Colonel Franklin B. Moon, Galveston District Engineer, met with officials from Baytown on 15 February 1968 to discuss potential measures for protection of the area, including a levee adjacent to the Houston Ship Channel. The interests represented by the Baytown Board are anxious that the problem be solved as soon as possible and they inquired about the possibility of early preparation of a report by the Corps on the proposal. One of the key elements of the plan in the concept study would be a permanent lowering of the water surface of the three bays to about 2.5 feet below sea level, thus reclaiming land. Also, the plan proposes replacement of salt water inside the leveed area with fresh water, thus changing the ecology and marine habitat characteristics. Because of the special characteristics of the proposed plan, it is believed desirable that any study by the Corps be in response to a special study authority, such as provided by a specific legislation or an item in a Flood Control Act, for a survey of Burnett, Crystal, and Scotts Bays and vicinity, Baytown, Texas, in the interest of flood control, drainage and related land resources, particularly with respect to general subsidence of the area and flood problems created thereby.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM R. NEEDHAM,
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Assistant Director of Civil Works for Plains Divisions.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it is in response to the suggestion made in the letter that the study of this project be made in response to a special study authority that I am introducing this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3366) authorizing a survey of Burnett, Crystal, and Scotts Bays and vicinity, Baytown, Tex., for flood control and other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3366

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is authorized to make a survey of Burnett, Crystal, and Scotts Bays and vicinity, Baytown, Texas in the interest of flood control, drainage, and related water and land resources, including specifically the problems of general subsidence of the area and flood problems created thereby.

RESOLUTION

TO PRINT THE REPORT ENTITLED "MINERAL AND WATER RESOURCES OF MONTANA" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. METCALF submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 279); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 279

Resolved, That the compilation entitled "Mineral and Water Resources of Montana,"

a report by the United States Geological Survey, prepared at the request of Senator Lee Metcalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and that there be printed one thousand three hundred additional copies of such document for the use of that committee.

REREFERRAL OF BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Friday, April 19, I introduced two bills, S. 3349 and S. 3350, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10054, which amend the cold war GI bill. Through inadvertence, one of the bills, S. 3350, on GI flight training, was referred to the Committee on Finance, instead of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I hereby request unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of this bill, and that S. 3350 be re-referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GRANTS FOR COOPERATIVE EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 705

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I am submitting an amendment to the higher education amendments bill S. 3098, to add a new part providing support for cooperative education programs.

The amendment, Mr. President, is one in which I am joined by Senator KUCHEL as principal cosponsor. It has a great deal of similarity to S. 1736, which I also introduced with Senator KUCHEL and 17 other cosponsors on May 10, 1967. The Education Subcommittee has held hearings and taken testimony on this proposal and cooperative education in general. I offer this amendment now because the form of it and the language is that which has been agreed upon in consultation with the Office of Education. It is an amendment which has also been offered in the House by Mr. GIBBONS, and it is under consideration in committee there also.

Under S. 1736 a 5-year authorization was contemplated at the level of \$7,250,000 annually, from which would be provided aid to institutions in developing cooperative education in an amount no greater than \$65,000 in any one year. The amendment expands this somewhat, asking \$8 million for fiscal year 1969, \$10 million for fiscal year 1970, \$12 million for fiscal year 1971, and \$15 million for each of the succeeding fiscal years. In addition, S. 1736 asked for \$725,000 annually for training or research grants, while the amendment increases this to \$750,000 annually.

Mr. President, there has been growing realization of the role which cooperative education—that is, education in which the employer and the institution cooperate so that the student alternates full-time study with full-time work—has as a needed education tool. Senator KUCHEL spoke at some length on this matter on April 11, and his remarks will be found in that day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 9701-9072. The other

Senators who are cosponsors of S. 1736, and who I am sure will likewise give full support to this amendment, are Senators BAYH, BENNETT, BURDICK, COOPER, FONG, FULBRIGHT, HATFIELD, INOUE, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MONTOYA, MORSE, YARBOROUGH, PASTORE, CLARK, and GRUENING.

There are excellent reasons why this amendment should be incorporated in the Higher Education Act amendments, and I am hopeful that the subcommittee and the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will include it in the bill as it is offered to the Senate for its adoption sometime in the next few weeks.

First, there is the educational benefit to be derived. I put this point first deliberately, rather than stressing first the economic aspects of self-help for the student. I do so because in so many ways it is the more important of the two.

To capsize the educational benefit, to which many witnesses in the direct line of cooperative education have testified before both House and Senate Education Subcommittees, the academic course work "comes alive" for students who find themselves correlating class room learning with practical on-the-job experience of the kind of situations they will face in their later careers. There is added meaning given to the classroom in this way, and a heightened degree of learning absorption. To anyone who is aware of the psychological principles of learning, it is obvious that the "learning by doing" pragmatism of the workplace fleshes out the abstractions of the ivory tower to their mutual benefit.

Then, too, there is a desirable application of what the philosopher William Hocking called the principle of alternation. The periods of classroom concentration are broken and made more intensive for the change by the alternating periods of scene changing to the environment of the "real" world of full-time employment. The perspective shifts, and the whole experience takes on the hue of a more balanced approach to the same problems, seen from the complementary poles of the theoretical and the practical application of theory. The result is a much better preparation by the student to step into a job without missing a stride after his graduation, while many in the more common educational tradition find themselves floundering for a while as they try to adjust to an unfamiliar environment.

These factors are of particular importance as we seek to provide greater opportunities for participation by minority group members in the full scope of American industrial and commercial life. A leading company's college recruiter has pointed out that 70 percent of minority group college graduates choose teaching as a career. The benefits of cooperative education are especially strong in encouraging a broader scope of career examination. As Dr. Rembert Sokes, president of Wilberforce College, has noted, one result of the cooperative work-study experience for students such as those who make up most of the Wilberforce enrollment is to dispel "doubt and disbelief that real, new career opportunities exist."

Dr. Stokes has also pointed out that practical achievement brings a new pride and belief in oneself; that the alteration of work and study brings "greater facility for understanding how to live effectively in a complex society," and that successful achievement through work-study, campus-employer relations leads more students to preparation for higher professional careers than would otherwise attempt them.

Further, to take the other major aspect of the benefits—the economic advantage—there is again a psychology which is of particular assistance in stimulating the capable youth from a lowly economic stratum. For those whose income and experience is measured in tens of dollars while others deal with hundreds, indebtedness is often something to be feared and avoided. If there are insufficient savings, as is common under such circumstances, and if scholarship and direct aid is insufficient, there is a timidity about borrowing for school. There is fear that graduation—and often that goal looks very distant indeed—will not necessarily be the open sesame to a job with income sufficient to repay indebtedness. Rather, it may be a millstone around the neck of the graduate.

So the opportunity to earn is a vast encouragement to a group of potential contributors to society, young men and women with ample abilities but subject to possible construction of them unless they receive practical encouragement, a group who collectively earned \$95 million last year. For the 56,000 students in cooperative education programs at 112 institutions in 1966-67, this meant an average self-help of about \$1,900. To a great many, this makes the difference between continuing their education and foregoing it for economic reasons.

Many institutions have expressed a desire to join in this type of education. Even without the assistance proposed in this amendment, the list of those with such programs has risen in 1968 to 119 at present while the enrollment has reached a total of 61,000. Collectively these students are earning \$104 million in their full-time jobs during the work periods away from the campus and the classroom.

Now, it is a significant fact that these students are paying at least 10 percent of their total earnings in taxes to the Federal and State Governments. That comes to more than \$10 million—more than the \$8 million the amendment asks for the first year's program. The remaining \$94 million pays for all, or nearly all, of the cost of these students' education.

That is the existing situation. From the cost standpoint, the results are even more remarkable, although as I have said it is best to keep the educational values as our primary focus. The assistance offered here for cooperative education would enable more than 400 additional institutions of higher learning to move vigorously to expand this method, with the grants of up to \$75,000 per year allowing employment of professionally qualified staffs to supervise and coordinate the programs. As a result, with opportunity created in the next few years for an additional 250,000 students

to join those now in these programs, I anticipate earnings among them to expand to more than \$500 million per year. In addition to the tax results to the Federal Government through income tax receipts well in excess of the program's costs, there is the permanent and far greater additional Federal income throughout the lifetime of all those whose skills have upgraded their income and thereby added to income tax payments.

Many of the institutions which would be affected are smaller schools, although large universities are also already involved. For such a school as the Indiana Institute of Technology, located in Fort Wayne, the institution itself will be greatly strengthened by this assistance. Indiana Tech has had a small co-op program for the past 5 years, with about 100 students currently involved out of a 1,200-member student body. They are eager to expand this program, and have sought funds from the Office of Education to do so—funds which unfortunately were not available to them for the next academic year. But President Edward Dugan has informed me, and this is a clue to the situation throughout the country, that they now have about 100 firms on their waiting list, ready to cooperate with an expanded program, and that of the anticipated freshman class of about 300 for next fall some 60 percent have indicated they would like to be in a cooperative education program.

For such schools as these, the opportunity to secure "seed money" for developing this service is very greatly needed. It is no less needed in many larger and stronger institutions, where the pressures for funds make innovations of this kind take a back seat to current traditional programs. The incentives which the proposed Federal grants will supply are sufficient, even with a \$75,000 limit per institution, to stimulate a rapid increase in this highly practical form of education.

I sincerely hope that when the Higher Education Act amendments are presented to the Senate by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, it will include the opportunity to include action on this most significant means of assistance to higher education.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a summary of the proposed amendments, together with a current list of the 119 institutions now offering cooperative education programs, as prepared by the National Commission for Cooperative Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary and list will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 705) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The summary and list, presented by Mr. HARTKE, are as follows:

SUMMARY OF HARTKE-KUCHEL AMENDMENTS TO S. 3098

The proposed amendments to S. 3098, the Higher Education Amendments bill of 1968, would add a new part D to title IV (Student

Assistance) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize the Commissioner of Education to make (1) grants to institutions of higher education (not in excess of \$75,000 to any one institution for any fiscal year) to plan, establish, expand, or carry out programs of "cooperative education" under which students would alternate periods of full-time academic study with periods of full-time public or private employment, and (2) grants to, or contracts with, such institutions, or (as variously provided) other public or private organizations, for the training of persons in the planning and operation of cooperative education programs, or for research into methods of improving, developing, or promoting the use of such programs in institutions of higher education.

Employment under these programs would be designed to provide students not only with financial assistance for continuing their education but also with work experience related to their courses of study. However, grants would not be available for compensation of students for their employment by employers participating in the programs.

In developing criteria for approval of cooperative education grants, the Commissioner would be required to consult with the Advisory Council on Financial Aid to Students to be established by title IV of S. 3098.

There would be authorized to be appropriated \$8 million for fiscal 1969, \$10 million for fiscal 1970, \$12 million for fiscal 1971, and \$15 million for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973, for cooperative education grants, and \$750,000 per fiscal year, 1969 through 1973, for training and research grants and contracts.

These amendments would supersede § 409 (b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be added by S. 3098, which would have authorized institutions of higher education to use a portion of their work-study allocation to pay administrative costs of developing or carrying out programs of cooperative education. The present proposal, like the one to be superseded, includes accredited proprietary institutions within the definition of "institution of higher education."

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OFFERING COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

At many of these 119 institutions, only some of the students are on the cooperative plan: it may be an optional plan, it may be offered in only some academic majors, it may be an honors plan. The interested student should write to the Admissions Office of the college or university of his choice requesting information about their program, and to secure specific information about the requirements for admission, scholarships, and possible financial assistance.

Alabama: Alabama Agricultural & Mechanical College, Normal; Auburn University, Auburn; Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute; University of Alabama, University.
Arizona: University of Arizona, Tucson.
Arkansas: University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

California: California State College at Los Angeles; California State Polytechnic College, Pomona; College of San Mateo, San Mateo; Foothill College, Los Altos Hills; Golden Gate College, San Francisco; San Jose State College; University of California, Berkeley.

Colorado: University of Denver.
District of Columbia: Howard University, Washington; The American University, Washington.

Florida: Florida A & M University, Tallahassee; Florida State University, Tallahassee; Florida Technological University, Orlando; Manatee Junior College, Bradenton; Miami-Dade Junior College, South Campus, Miami; Pensacola Junior College; University of Florida, Gainesville; University of Miami, Coral Gables; University of South Florida, Tampa; University of West Florida, Pensacola.

Georgia: Berry College, Mt. Berry; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.

Idaho: University of Idaho, Moscow.

Illinois: Bradley University, Peoria; Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago; Northwestern University, Technological Institute, Evanston; Southern Illinois University, Carbondale; University of Illinois, Urbana.

Indiana: Indiana Institute of Technology, Fort Wayne; Indiana State University, Terre Haute; Purdue University, Lafayette; Tri-State College, Angola; University of Evansville.

Iowa: Iowa State University, Ames.

Kansas: Friends University, Wichita; Kansas State University, Manhattan.

Kentucky: University of Louisville; Western Kentucky University, Bowling Green.

Louisiana: Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston; Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

Massachusetts: Cambridge School, Boston; Northeastern University, Boston.

Michigan: Central Michigan University, Mt. Pleasant; Delta College, University Center; Detroit Institute of Technology, Detroit; Ferris State College, Big Rapids; General Motors Institute, Flint; Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo; University of Detroit; University of Michigan, Dearborn; Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

Minnesota: Concordia College, Moorhead; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Mississippi: Mississippi State University, State College.

Missouri: Rockhurst College, Kansas City; University of Missouri, Columbia; University of Missouri at Rolla; W. & W. Technical Institute, Neosho.

New Jersey: Bloomfield College, Bloomfield; Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

New Mexico: New Mexico Institute of Mining & Technology, Socorro; New Mexico State University, University Park.

New York: Adelphi University, Garden City; Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson; Borough of Manhattan Community College, New York City; Broome Technical Community College, Binghamton; City College of the City University of New York, N.Y.C.; College of Insurance, New York City; Cornell University, Ithaca; Elmira College, Elmira; Keuka College, Keuka Park; Mohawk Valley Community College, Utica; New York Institute of Technology, Old Westbury; Pratt Institute, Brooklyn; Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy; Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester; Vorhees Technical Institute, New York City.

Ohio: Antioch College, Yellow Springs; The Cleveland State University, Cleveland (formerly Fenn College); Kent State University, Kent; Ohio College of Applied Science, Cincinnati; Sinclair Community College, Dayton; University of Akron; University of Cincinnati; Wilberforce University, Wilberforce; Wilmington College, Wilmington.

Pennsylvania: Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia; St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia; Temple University Technical Institute, Philadelphia; The Pennsylvania State University, University Park.

Rhode Island: Roger Williams Junior College, Providence.

Tennessee: Tennessee A and I State University, Nashville; Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville; University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Texas: Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont; Southern Methodist University, Dallas; Texas A & M University, College Station; University of Houston, Houston; University of St. Thomas, Houston; University of Texas at Arlington; University of Texas, Austin.

Vermont: Bennington College, Bennington; Goddard College, Plainfield.

Virginia: Hampton Institute, Hampton; Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg.

Washington: Washington State University, Pullman.

West Virginia: Alderson-Broadbent College, Philippi.

Wisconsin: Beloit College, Beloit; Marquette University, Milwaukee; Milwaukee School of Engineering, Milwaukee; Stout State University, Menomonie; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee; Wisconsin State University-Platteville, Platteville.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 698, THE INTERGOVERNMENT COOPERATION ACT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, Committee on Government Operations, will hold hearings on S. 698, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, beginning on May 9 and 10, and continuing on May 14, 15, and 16. Subsequent hearings will be announced at a later date.

S. 698 embodies, with some modifications, the provisions of S. 561, which was passed by the Senate in August 1965, and of S. 1681, which was passed by the Senate in July 1966, together with some new provisions.

It is the purpose of S. 698 to achieve a more complete cooperation and coordination among the levels of Government in order to improve the operation of our Federal system in an increasingly complex society. The bill is based on investigations made by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations over the last 5 years, on the studies and recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and on many suggestions offered by witnesses in hearings held on S. 561, S. 1681 and other legislation.

This legislation would, among other things, improve the administration of grants-in-aid to the States, provide for periodic congressional review of Federal grants-in-aid, make provision for reimbursable technical services by Federal agencies to States and local governments, provide for coordinated intergovernmental policy and administration of Federal assistance for urban development, provide for the acquisition, use and disposition of land within urban areas by Federal agencies in conformity with local government programs, and establish a uniform relocation assistance policy for persons and businesses displaced by Federal or federally assisted programs. These provisions have been the subject of earlier hearings held in connection with S. 561 and S. 1681.

New provisions of S. 698 would provide a method for the consolidation of Federal grant-in-aid programs and would establish a uniform land acquisition policy for Federal programs and federally assisted programs.

The hearings on May 9 and 10 will be in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. The time and place of subsequent hearings will be announced later.

Any Senator or other person wishing to testify should notify the subcommittee, room 357, Old Senate Office Building, extension 4718, in order that he might be scheduled as a witness.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD WEINBERG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE SOLICITOR, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the President has nominated Edward Weinberg, of Maryland, as Solicitor for the Department of the Interior. Hearings will be held on April 25 at 2:30 p.m. in room 3110, New Senate Office Building. Those desiring to be heard will please notify the clerk of the committee.

CONFERENCE ENDORSES INTERNATIONAL HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND LABOR BILL, S. 1779; HEARINGS ANNOUNCED FOR THURSDAY AND FRIDAY APRIL 25 AND 26

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Third Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance was held in Lima, Peru, from Sunday, March 31, until Thursday, April 4, 1968. The conference was attended by 298 participants from 17 Latin American countries and 34 States of the United States.

There were four committees which issued reports at the conference, one of these being the Committee on Education. I was pleased to learn that this committee passed only two resolutions, one of which was a resolution of support for my bill S. 1779, to establish an International Health, Education, and Labor Foundation designed to strengthen and maintain free and independent societies.

This is indeed a matter of significant timing since hearings on this important bill will be held this Thursday and Friday, April 25 and 26, at 10 a.m. in room 4230 of the New Senate Office Building.

To illustrate the importance of this measure I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution adopted at the Conference in Lima, Peru, and a copy of my bill, S. 1779, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS

Senate Bill No. 1779 has been discussed and evaluated by the United States delegates who are members of the Committee on Education of the Third Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance for Progress. Committed as all of our partners are to the strengthening of inter-American understanding, we applaud and support the effort of Senator Yarborough and his Senate colleagues in seeking the establishment of an International Health, Education and Labor Foundation designed to increase the bonds of friendship among the peoples of the world and to strengthen their capacities to develop and maintain free and independent societies. We, therefore, recommend that the United States delegates members of this Committee, acquaint themselves with the bill and support the objectives and the goals which the sponsors of Bill 1779 are endeavoring to secure in the Congress of USA.

ARTHUR WARNER,
Chairman.
EDUARDO KING CARR,
Cochairman.

S. 1779

A bill to establish an international health, education and labor program to provide open support for private, nongovernmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF FOUNDATION

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established as an independent agency of the Government an International Health, Education, and Labor Foundation (hereinafter referred to as the "Foundation").

(b) The Foundation shall be composed of a Director and an International Health, Education, and Labor Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

(c) The purposes of the Foundation shall be to establish and conduct an international health, education, and labor program under which the Foundation shall provide open support for private, nongovernmental activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields, designed—

(1) to promote a better knowledge of the United States among the peoples of the world;

(2) to increase friendship and understanding among the peoples of the world; and

(3) to strengthen the capacity of the other peoples of the world to develop and maintain free, independent societies in their own nations.

DIRECTOR OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 2. (a) The Foundation shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The person nominated for appointment as the Director shall be a distinguished citizen who has demonstrated exceptional qualities and abilities necessary to enable him to successfully perform the functions of the office of the Director.

(b) The Director shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5311 of title 5, United States Code, and shall serve for a term of five years.

(c) The Director, with the advice of the Council, shall exercise all of the authority granted to the Foundation by this Act and shall serve as chief executive officer of the Foundation.

COUNCIL

SEC. 3. (a) The Council shall consist of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members of the Council (1) shall be eminent in the fields of education, student activities, youth activities, labor, health, scientific research or other fields pertinent to the functions of the Foundation; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service; and (3) shall not be officers or employees of the Government of the United States. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by leading private associations, institutions, and organizations concerned with private activities in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Council shall be six years, except that (1) the terms of the members first appointed shall expire, as designated by the President, three at the end of two years, four at the end of four years, and four at the end of six years after the date of enactment of this Act; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed. No member shall be eligible for reappointment during the two-year period following the expiration of his term.

(c) The members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation and shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) The President shall call the first meeting of the Council and designate an Acting

Chairman. The Board shall, from time to time thereafter, select one of its members to serve as Chairman of the Council.

(e) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less than once every six months. Six members of the Council shall constitute a quorum.

(f) The Council (1) shall advise the Director with respect to policies, programs, and procedures for carrying out his functions, and (2) shall review applications for financial support submitted pursuant to section 4 and make recommendations thereon to the Director. The Director shall not approve or disapprove any such application until he has received the recommendation of the Council thereon, unless the Council fails to make a recommendation on such application within a reasonable time.

(g) The Council shall, on or before the 31st day of January, of each year, submit an annual report to the President and the Congress summarizing the activities of the Council during the preceding calendar year and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate. The contents of each report so submitted shall promptly be made available to the public.

GRANTS IN SUPPORT OF PRIVATE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 4. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this Act, the Director is authorized, subject to section 3(f), to make grants to private, nonprofit agencies, associations, and organizations organized in the United States, to public or private nonprofit educational institutions located in the United States, and to individuals or groups of individuals who are citizens of the United States not employed by the Government of the United States, a State or political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia, for the purpose of enabling them to assist, provide, or participate in international activities, conferences, meetings, and seminars in the fields of health, education, and labor, and other welfare fields related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act. No portion of any funds granted under this section shall be paid by the Director, or by any recipient of a grant under this section, to support any intelligence-gathering activity on behalf of the United States or to support any activity carried on by any officer or employee of the United States.

(b) Each grant shall be made by the Director under this section only upon application therefor in such form and containing such information as may be required by the Director and only on condition that the recipient of such grant will conduct openly all activities supported by such grant and make such reports as the Director may require solely to determine that the funds so granted are applied to the purpose for which application is made.

(c) The Director shall develop procedures and rules with respect to the approval or disapproval of applications for grants under this section which will provide, insofar as practicable, an equitable distribution of grants among the various applicants for such grants and types of activities to be supported by such grants, but which will assure that grants will be made to those qualified recipients most capable of achieving a successful or significant contribution favorably related to the purposes set forth in the first section of this Act. In making grants under this section, the Director shall not impose any requirements therefor or conditions thereon which impair the freedom of thought and expression of any recipients or other beneficiaries of such grants.

(d) The Director may (1) pay grants in such installments as he may deem appropriate and (2) provide for such adjustment of payments under this section as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, total withholding of payments.

PUBLIC REPORTS BY DIRECTOR

SEC. 5. The Director shall, on or before the 31st day of January of each year, submit an

annual report to the President and the Congress setting forth a summary of his activities under this Act during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall include a list of the grants made by the Director during the preceding calendar year; a statement of the use to which each recipient applied any grant received during the preceding calendar year; and any recommendations which the Director may deem appropriate. The contents of each report so submitted shall promptly be made available to the public.

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 6. The Director shall have authority, within the limits of funds available under section 9, to—

(1) prescribe such rules and regulations as he deems necessary governing the manner of the operations of the Foundation, and its organizations and personnel;

(2) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable the Foundation to carry out its functions under this Act, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates: except that the salary of any person so employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) obtain the services of experts and consultants from private life, as may be required by the Director or the Council, in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code;

(4) accept and utilize on behalf of the Foundation the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel from private life and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code;

(5) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, by private, nongovernmental sources, without condition or restriction other than that it be used for any of the purposes of the Foundation; and to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property in carrying out the purposes of this Act; and

(6) make other expenditures necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this Act.

PROHIBITION AGAINST REQUIRING INTELLIGENCE GATHERING

SEC. 7. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall request or require any recipient or any other beneficiary of any grant made under this Act to obtain, furnish, or report, or cause to be obtained, furnished, or reported, any information relating, directly or indirectly, to any activity supported by such grant, except as is (1) provided by section 4(b) of this Act or (2) authorized under law in the case of any information directly relating to the violation of any criminal law of the United States by such recipient or beneficiary.

INDEPENDENCE FROM EXECUTIVE CONTROL

SEC. 8. (a) Determinations made by the Director and the Council in the discharge of their functions under this Act shall not be subject to review or control by the President or by any other department, agency, officer, or employee of the Government.

(b) The provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (relating to administrative procedure), and of chapter 7 of such title (relating to judicial review), shall not apply with respect to the exercise by the Director or the Council of their functions under this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Foundation such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, except that the aggregate of such

sums appropriated prior to June 30, 1972, shall not exceed \$100 million. Sums appropriated under this section shall remain available until expended.

THE REAL OBJECTION TO HOLDING PRELIMINARY TALKS IN CAMBODIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there has been considerable critical comment over the refusal of President Johnson to agree to the proposal of North Vietnam that preliminary talks be held at Phnom Penh, Cambodia. Hanoi has claimed that this refusal indicates bad faith on the part of the President when he stated several weeks ago that the United States would go anywhere at any time to engage in talks.

State Department spokesmen have stated that the reason for rejection of Cambodia is that we do not have diplomatic relations with its Government. But what has not been stated is the real reason, and the failure of the administration to state it publicly is another example of the credibility gap—the failure to give the American people the facts in pursuance of their right to know.

The real reason came to light yesterday.

In an April 22 Washington Post column, entitled "New Cambodian Route Aids Expansion of VC Forces," the knowledgeable columnist Joseph Alsop points out that thousands of tons of war materiel have been landed at Cambodian ports by freighters, then carried forward over the Cambodian roads and rivers, "not, apparently, without the help of purchased persons in the Cambodian Defense Ministry—for army trucks are known to have been used. Thus they are moved to the Vietnamese border and along the border roads North Vietnamese have secretly built."

Mr. Alsop points out that these supplies are then transported from the Cambodian border by sampan convoys over the river and canal system—especially in the III and IV Corps Areas of South Vietnam.

He concludes his article by saying:

The existence of this new system has been known in Washington for many months. Nothing has been said about it. And the puzzle is why the American Government is perfectly content to observe the old rules, while always permitting the enemy to fight the war by quite a different, exceedingly novel set of rules.

It is high time, Mr. President, for the administration to not only let the American people know the facts about Cambodia, but to take appropriate action to protect our fighting men and those of our allies from this source of war materiel. It would, of course, be unthinkable to hold talks in any country which is being used by North Vietnam to supply its forces in South Vietnam. And it is unthinkable that, as Mr. Alsop points out, nothing has been said about the situation by those in control of our Federal Government. The people want to know "Why not?"

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's article be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1968]
NEW CAMBODIAN ROUTE AIDS EXPANSION OF VC FORCES

(By Joseph Alsop)

CANTHO, SOUTH VIETNAM.—In this largest city of the Vietnamese Delta, headquarters of all IV Corps, there are many things worthy of note. There is the successfully aggressive energy of the new ARVN corps commander, Gen. Nguyen Duc Thanh, to begin with.

There are the vast smokes still billowing up from one of the greatest VC secret base areas, the huge impenetrable Umin Forest. The first fire was set by fishermen enraged by the VC and, at the moment, our aircraft cannot go in to encourage the flames with napalm, because the secondary explosions are too numerous and violent to permit low-level bombing runs.

Again, there is the fact that village people long under VC control have held angry demonstrations and have even attacked VC cadre, because their sons and sampans were "borrowed" from them for the Tet offensive, and have not been returned for the grimest possible reason. This has even happened in the Camau Peninsula, in several districts that have been under Communist control for a quarter of a century.

On the other side of the balance sheet, there is the ominous fact that the VC are now substantially expanding their armed forces in the Delta, for example, by increasing their main force and provincial battalions from 24 to 33 in both categories. In a large measure, this is being accomplished by short-range measures of a risky character—press-ganging the youth, raising taxes harshly, and so on and on. But the Delta is one remaining manpower pool in South Vietnam and the VC are doing their best to exploit the pool's resources to the utmost.

That fact hooks on, quite directly, to the second fact that stands out like a sore thumb on the minus side of the Delta balance sheet. Briefly, the Delta's remaining manpower has not been exploited to the utmost by the VC since the great "victory" drafts of 1965, because there were two important limiting factors.

The least important was the VC desire not to alienate too many of the people in this region really beyond Hanoi's easy reach. The decisive factor was, quite simply, the larger forces in the Delta could not be supplied and maintained by the lines of communication that were still in use until less than a year ago.

All that is changed now, however. In IV Corps, in III Corps and in at least half of II Corps, all needed military supplies now originate in Cambodia; and in III and II Corps, Cambodia also provides most of the food for the bigger enemy units.

There is, in fact, a brand new supply system that began to operate less than a year ago, toward the beginning of the Delta's last high-water season. A defector from high up in the supply apparatus has explained exactly how it works.

Weapons, ammunition and the like are now landed at Cambodian ports by freighters carrying very big shipments. They are then carried forward over the Cambodian road and river not, apparently, without the help of purchased persons in the Cambodian Defense Ministry—for army trucks are known to have been used. Thus they are moved to the Vietnamese border and along the border roads the North Vietnamese have secretly built.

For the delta, the supplies off-loaded at the border are then transported forward to points of use in night-moving sampan convoys, over the river and canal system that covers this whole area.

The defector above-mentioned stated that in the last high-water season there had been two big sampan convoys per month through-

out the whole season, delivering above 10,000 tons of supplies to the VC in the Delta alone.

In III Corps, supplies move into the so-called parrot's beak, where the Cambodian border thrusts inward toward Saigon; and thence they again move forward by sampan over the river system. In this Corps area, too, lateral roads newly built by the North Vietnamese troops into the border's jungles, are also used for supply movements by bicycle and even by truck.

The new Cambodian system is known to have provided over 30,000 tons of supplies for the enemy in III Corps, plus an unknown but large total for the enemy in II Corps in the last year. This, of course, solves a major puzzle.

The puzzle was to know how the old lines of communication could carry the load of the big North Vietnamese reinforcement flow, plus the huge additional supply load required by the new, much heavier, much more advanced weaponry the enemy has now introduced.

The answer to the puzzle is the new Cambodian supply system.

That does not answer another puzzle, however. The existence of this new system has been known in Washington for many months. Nothing has been said about it. And the puzzle is why the American Government is perfectly content to observe the old rules, while always permitting the enemy to fight the war by quite a different, exceedingly novel set of rules.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 20 minutes in the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

OIL IMPORT PROGRAM NEEDS RE-EXAMINATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have the unpleasant duty to bring to the attention of the Senate once again the startling inequities that continue to plague the oil import program.

The program must be changed to fulfill its announced goals. A halting start has been made in the form of proposed changes in the oil import regulations, but more needs to be done now. The oil import quota program has been in existence for almost 10 years without ever really having its underlying rationale scrutinized.

Secretary Udall, the day before I made my last speech on the program, announced that he would hold public departmental hearings in order to re-evaluate the program. I had hoped that, perhaps, something would come out of these hearings in which the Secretary had announced he would take a personal part. After all, no one, to my knowledge, has ever questioned the Secretary's personal integrity or his ability to correct defects in his Department once he took a personal interest in a problem.

However, at his press conference on Wednesday, April 17, 1968, Secretary Udall announced that he would not hold these badly needed hearings because he saw "no necessity" for them. I find that statement incomprehensible.

I have come across many irregularities and irrationalities in the program that

must be corrected. I am no oil or petrochemical expert, but by just applying a little commonsense, I can see the program is not meeting its stated goals, is forcing the American consumer to pay higher prices, is creating an artificial economic situation, and is injuring our balance of payments posture.

Let me reiterate for a moment some of the defects in the program which I have already brought to Secretary Udall's attention.

A few weeks ago the Secretary increased the oil import allocation for petrochemical producers by 12,000 barrels a day and Standard Oil of Indiana received 7,213 of the total for an energy product. This should never have happened. Standard claimed BTX as a petrochemical plant input even though it was only used by Standard as an octane booster for its gasoline. If Standard had received this amount of foreign crude, it would have received a \$3,000,000 windfall because there is a \$1.25 differential in the cost of domestic versus foreign crude oil.

UDALL ACTED

Fortunately, in this instance, the Secretary took steps to stop this perversion of the oil import program, after I called it to his attention. He denied Standard this amount because they claimed it in an amended application filed after the final filing date and they had not gotten his permission to do so. Although he allowed several other companies to file amendments after the final filing date without his permission, I think his action here was justified by the inequities that would have otherwise resulted. However, since this matter is now in litigation, I will not comment further on the situation.

On March 21, 1968, here on the Senate floor, I spoke at some length and in some detail about defects in the present oil import program. Apparently, Secretary Udall does not consider the points that I raised sufficiently important to justify a complete reexamination of the oil import program, although he has responded to some of my criticism.

Let me briefly restate some of the more important matters which I discussed then. The stated justification for the oil import program is to strengthen our national defense posture, but the program has encouraged the centralization of our refinery capacity so that just two enemy H bombs could wipe out over 50 percent of our total refinery capacity. Imagine, just two bombs. Because of the limitations of the program many petrochemical companies may be forced to build their new petrochemical plants abroad which will cost Americans about 5,000 jobs per plant and injure our balance of payments by about \$150,000,000 per plant. Finally, the present regulations are so complex and the staff which administers them is so small, that many companies are encouraged to evade the apparent program restrictions.

SPECIAL INTEREST "GRAB BAG"

The present oil import program has come to be looked upon as a special interest grab bag, encouraging each company to ask, "What's in it for me?" This should not be permitted to continue.

If special treatment is to be condoned

and even encouraged under the oil import program, a reexamination of each situation's rationale is required.

Puerto Rico has long been considered a special situation. The oil import program has been used to aid the depressed Puerto Rican economy by using the indirect subsidy of import allocations of foreign oil to encourage the construction of a refining and petrochemical industry on the island. Let me make one point clear. I am delighted that the Puerto Ricans have shown such ingenuity in using the oil import program to bolster their depressed economy. It is far better to provide jobs and wages to the people than it is to maintain them at a subsistence level on welfare. The point I am making, however, is that no one has examined the use of the oil import program in terms of aiding depressed areas generally. Although I am not sure that the present program should be used for such a purpose, if it is to be used for such a purpose why should it not be used to benefit all depressed areas? Why Puerto Rico, alone?

SUN OIL GETS NEW QUOTA

This question should certainly be answered before any new special quotas into Puerto Rico are granted. And yet, at his press conference, Secretary Udall indicated he would grant Sun Oil Co. a new quota into Puerto Rico. I later learned Sun Oil Co. would be allowed to import 60,000 barrels a day of foreign crude into Puerto Rico and ship 29,500 barrels a day of various products into the United States from Puerto Rico. I do not know whether this new quota is justifiable, but I recognize that much negotiation preceded the Secretary's decision and that many plans have been made in reliance upon the decision. However, this should not obscure the basic point—should the oil import program be used for the purpose of helping depressed areas and, if so, why only Puerto Rico?

As a matter of fact, if the aim of the special treatment of Puerto Rico is to provide the maximum benefit for the Puerto Rican economy, the best way to achieve this goal is not through purely private negotiations. Once the Puerto Rican government decides that a petrochemical complex is necessary, it should publicly announce what the optimum requirements of the desired complex are and then let interested companies compete for the project. Although the final details would probably have to be negotiated, by opening the project to all interested parties, Puerto Rico will be in a better bargaining position and should avoid any charges of "favoritism" by disappointed companies.

Another problem that has occurred in connection with the Puerto Rican segment of the oil import program has to do with 10,000 barrels per day of gasoline which Commonwealth Oil Co. used to ship to the west coast from Puerto Rico but now proposes to ship to the east coast. Although I asked Secretary Udall how Commonwealth Oil Co. got this excess 10,000 barrels a day in the first place, since under the regulations imports into Puerto Rico are supposed to equal the total of domestic Puerto Rican needs, exports from Puerto Rico and the amount

historically shipped from Puerto Rico to the United States, he has not responded to the question.

He announced on December 15, 1967, that he would permit the shipment to be diverted to the east coast because "the change will substantially expand employment opportunities in Puerto Rico through further development of its petrochemical and satellite industries." Because I could not understand how the processing of the same 10,000 barrels of gasoline a day they had been processing would increase employment I asked him and received back a letter stating that the decision to allow the shipment into the east coast had "not been implemented as no application, required under the regulations, has been approved, as yet." Although one might, on other grounds, justify increasing Commonwealth Oil Co.'s quota, the decision to allow them to ship an additional 10,000 barrels a day of gasoline into the east coast certainly cannot be justified within the terms of section 15(c) of the oil import regulations, which is the section under which Secretary Udall has proposed to proceed.

THE FREEPORT REFINERY

In that same letter I also brought to his attention the proposed new refinery in Freeport in the Bahamas. Certain American interests plan to build, I believe, about a 275,000-barrel-a-day refinery there. The refinery makes no sense unless its production is imported into the United States. All the residual fuel which is produced there can be imported into the United States virtually without limit. However, the refinery must also produce naphtha which it could not ship to the United States, without first routing it through Puerto Rico.

I know of no reason why a plant whose only market is the United States should not be built in the United States. If restrictions on the amount of foreign crude which can be imported is the reason for not building the plant here—restrictions which would be evaded by shipping via Puerto Rico—we might give some consideration to modifying the program. Perhaps we could change the regulations so that foreign crude oil used to produce residual fuel oil would not be subject to any import quota.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES

One solution which has intrigued me, and which I hope the Secretary will investigate, is the use of foreign trade zones. If foreign oil could be imported into foreign trade zones without restriction, we might encourage the construction of new plants here in the United States without losing control of the amount of foreign oil which entered the United States. By imposing controls on the amounts of finished products which entered the United States from these foreign trade zones which are outside the customs barrier, although physically in the United States, we should avoid many of the complexities that burden the present oil import regulations. For example, a refinery, such as that planned for the Bahamas, could be constructed in a foreign trade zone and import non-quota residual oil which is not produced here in any significant amount. This would have the double benefit of pro-

viding jobs, as well as benefiting our defense posture by spreading out refineries and providing a source of residual oil in case war should shut off foreign supplies. The remainder of the refineries' products could be either sold in the world market or processed in the zone into some product which could then be imported into the United States.

I do not claim that foreign trade zones are the certain answer, but I think that the opportunity to use such zones should be available to those companies which are willing to risk the capital investment. The import for export plan which Secretaries Udall and Trowbridge announced in December of 1967 has not been heard of since. Under this program companies would be given import quotas on the basis of their exports of petrochemical and energy products. Perhaps, it is time to reexamine foreign trade zones as an alternative.

As a matter of fact, these foreign trade zones might be one way of solving the short supply of No. 2 fuel oil without increasing our reliance upon foreign sources. If No. 2 fuel oil could be imported from foreign trade zones, refineries could be built to produce this type of fuel, which is used to heat many homes, particularly in the Northeast. All or almost all the suppliers of No. 2 fuel oil within the past week have increased their wholesale prices by four-tenths of a cent a gallon. In New England, alone, which consumed about 4 billion gallons of No. 2 fuel oil last year, this represents a \$16 million price increase which might have been avoided if we had increased refinery capacity in foreign trade zones.

PETROCHEMICAL QUOTAS

The petrochemical aspect of the oil import program has come in for its share of criticism. I have joined in. Although I do not have an answer from Secretary Udall yet, I have asked him to rework the petrochemical oil import quota allocations for the second half of 1968 to reflect the excessive quotas that some companies received because they claimed and were allowed to claim petrochemical plant inputs in 1967 which were later determined to be ineligible. All the petrochemical companies share one pie. No company should be discriminated against because another company claimed a larger share of the quota than they were entitled to under the regulations.

Hearings must be held to reexamine the rationale underlying the entire program as well as the special exemptions which keep creeping in.

Secretary Udall has already taken halting steps to correct some of the more apparent inequities in the present regulations. Although I disagree with some of the details of the amendments to the oil import regulations which were proposed for comment on March 15, I applaud the goal at which they were aimed. The energy and petrochemical systems should be separated. Whether the proposed regulations are the best way to do this is a technical question which I will leave to the experts.

However, certain problems do stand out even to the uninitiated. For example, why allow a company to get an import

quota for foreign oil based on inputs of petroleum coke as the proposed regulations do? After all, we are the world's largest supplier of petroleum coke, so there is really no reason to subsidize our domestic producers against foreign competition. Furthermore, the present regulations provide for a sliding scale for oil refiners so as to help the smaller companies but no similar scale is provided in the proposed regulations for the petrochemical companies. If one of the purposes of the program is to help smaller companies, why help only small refiners? Why not also help small petrochemical companies?

OIL IMPORT OFFICE WOEFULLY UNDERSTAFFED

A large part of the reason the program has been in such trouble is that any regulations which control the production of oil and petrochemical products must, of necessity, be complex, and the Oil Import Administration is woefully understaffed. Although I have some doubts about whether the Oil Import Administration should remain in the Department of the Interior or should be moved to some other Department or even made into a separate, independent agency, there is no question in my mind that it needs a larger staff and needs to be better financed.

One way of financing a larger staff, indeed, perhaps, one way to make a slight profit from the program would be to impose a fee of only one-half of 1 cent a barrel for each barrel of foreign crude which was imported under an allocation or license. Such a small fee would not really injure any of the recipients of the import allocations and would enable the Oil Import Administration to finance an adequate staff for the first time in its history. Texas imposes a three-sixteenths of 1 cent tax on each barrel of crude oil which is produced in Texas. It uses this money to pay the costs of the Texas Railroad Commission which controls oil and gas production in Texas. If such a plan has worked in Texas, surely such a plan would work for the oil import program.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the text of my letters to Secretary Udall and his replies.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 28, 1968.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, the Oil Import Administration on February 14 allocated a daily quota of 7,213 barrels of imported crude oil to the Standard Oil Company of Indiana. In my estimation this allocation, which, as I understand it, was made under the authority of regulations promulgated for the implementation of a petrochemical oil import quota program, disregards the purposes of the program and may well be in violation of the regulations themselves.

Section 9 (a) of the regulations states that petrochemical plant set-asides are to be made to persons having petrochemical plants. Section 22 (n) of the regulations defines a petrochemical plant as a facility "in which more than 50 percent (by weight) of . . . input are converted by chemical reactions into petrochemicals" (emphasis added). Section 22 (p) makes it very clear that the definition of "petrochemicals" does not include finished products such as gaso-

line—defined by the regulations as “a refined petroleum distillate which is suitable as a carburetor in internal combustion engines”. Yet this is exactly what Standard now produces—a gasoline product, BTX, which can be used “without further processing except blending by mechanical means” as a carburetor and, in fact, is so used. Consequently the Oil Import Administration’s decision to provide a very large daily import quota to Standard under the petrochemical program seems completely at odds with the facts.

The facts are that this import allocation, worth \$3 million a year, will be used to produce an energy product to enhance the octane rating of Standard’s gasoline; that the allocation will be of no assistance to the petrochemical industry in its efforts to compete overseas and improve our balance of payments posture; and that a continuation of this type of practice can only be considered an indirect subsidization of big oil in the United States to the detriment of the petrochemical industry for which the program was originally devised.

I want to make it crystal clear that this letter is in no way meant to be a final judgment on the merits of a petrochemical import program as contrasted with our traditional oil import program. However, if we are to have a fair and effective petrochemical import program, I believe that steps should be taken to revise the program to prohibit the type of misallocation demonstrated by the Standard Oil quota decision and to suspend Standard’s allocation as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1968.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: After examination of the facts regarding the recent oil import allocation to Standard Oil Company (Indiana) based on petrochemical plant inputs, I have determined that the allocation was made contrary to regulations and is therefore void. The deadline for filing oil import applications, as prescribed by Oil Import Regulation 1, expired November 2, 1967. The application of Standard Oil Company (Indiana) was not filed until December 15, 1967.

The deadline can be waived only by the Secretary of the Interior. I will not waive the deadline in this instance since the increased allocation to Standard Oil Company (Indiana) would be contrary to the purposes which the allocations to petrochemical companies were designed to serve.

Enclosed is a letter to Mr. George V. Myers, Executive Vice President, Standard Oil Company (Indiana) indicating my decision in this matter. Enclosed also is a letter to Mr. Lester D. Johnson, Commissioner of Customs, informing him that the license issued to Standard Oil Company (Indiana) is void.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1968.

MR. GEORGE V. MYERS,
Executive Vice President, Standard Oil Company (Indiana), Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. MYERS: In February of this year, the Oil Import Administration purported to make Standard Oil Company (Indiana) under section 9 of Oil Import Regulation 1 an allocation of imports of crude oil and unfinished oils into Districts I-IV in the amount of 7,213 b/d for the first 162 days of this allocation period. The Administrator also issued to the American Oil Company License No. 14-375, dated February 14, 1968, in the amount of 1,312,766 barrels of imports of crude oil.

These actions were not based on the initial application submitted with your letter dated October 27, 1967; they were based on a second application dated December 15, 1967. The time prescribed by section 5 of Oil Import Regulation 1, as amended, for the filing of applications, expired November 2, 1967. Although the application of December 15, 1967 was designated as a revised application, it was in substance a new one setting forth very substantial quantities of inputs and outputs not set forth in the original application.

The time limited in section 5 of the regulation for the filing of applications is binding on the Administrator. In the absence of a waiver by me, he is not authorized to consider an application filed late. The new application dated December 15, 1967 was not filed in time. Accordingly, the allocation and license mentioned in the first paragraph were improperly issued, were of no force or effect and, therefore, are void. I am so advising the Commissioner of Customs.

I will not waive the late filing in this instance because the making of an allocation to Standard Oil Company (Indiana) on the basis of the second application dated December 15, 1967 would defeat the purpose which section 9 of the regulation was designed to serve. The regulation was amended in May of 1966 to provide for the making of allocations to petrochemical plants. The objective of this modification of the program was stated much earlier in amendatory Proclamation 3693 of December 10, 1965, which conferred the authority under which section 9 of the regulation was issued—namely, to alleviate the inequities of a situation in which petrochemical plants without allocations were forced to compete against oil companies which had allocations and produced petrochemicals. The published notices of proposed rulemaking—December 15, 1965 and March 30, 1966—emphasized the objective of promoting the competitive capability of petrochemical plants. In effect, in its second application, Standard Oil Company (Indiana) sought a “petrochemical allocation” based upon material regularly manufactured by the company for use as a component of the unleaded motor fuel of which the company makes a specialty.

I am instructing the Administrator, Oil Import Administration, to make to Standard Oil Company (Indiana) an allocation based on the qualified inputs set forth in its initial application.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1968.

MR. LESTER D. JOHNSON,
Commissioner of Customs, Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: This letter will inform you that License No. 14-375, dated February 14, 1968, issued to the American Oil Company by the Oil Import Administration, Department of the Interior, is void. The license purported to authorize the importation of 1,312,766 barrels of crude oil (and within the quantity authorized—196,915 barrels in the form of unfinished oils) into Districts I-IV, as defined in Proclamation 3279, as amended, during the period ending July 31, 1963. I ask that Directors of Customs be notified promptly of the invalidity of this license.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

MARCH 29, 1968.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On December 15, 1967, you announced that you would permit Commonwealth Oil and Refining Company to shift its 10,000 barrels a day authorized

shipment of finished Puerto Rican oil products from the West Coast to the East Coast of the United States. This decision will allow Commonwealth to ship a total of 42,928 barrels a day of finished oil products, primarily gasoline, from Puerto Rico into the East Coast. The reason for the decision you announced was that the “change will substantially expand employment opportunities in Puerto Rico through further development of its petrochemical and satellite industries.”

I find it difficult to understand how the shift of the deliveries from the West Coast to the East Coast will “substantially expand employment opportunities in Puerto Rico.” The same amount of material will continue to be processed in Puerto Rico. The only difference will be in the destination of the products in the United States which could produce a severe dislocation in the West Coast gasoline market.

As a matter of fact, I have great difficulty comprehending why Commonwealth got this 10,000 barrel a day authorization to the West Coast in the first place. My understanding of the oil import regulations was that the import level into Puerto Rico was set to cover Puerto Rican domestic needs, export needs, and the amount historically shipped into the United States. Yet, on page 15 of your December 28, 1967 press conference, you talk of alleviating a surplus in Puerto Rico as the justification for originally authorizing the 10,000 barrels a day shipment to the West Coast. If there were a surplus in Puerto Rico, the solution, I should think, would be to cut down the level of allowable imports into Puerto Rico, not increase the authorized shipments into the United States.

I suggest you might also want to re-examine the oil imports into Puerto Rico and the possibility that Puerto Rico is being used to evade oil import restrictions. I understand that certain American interests are planning to construct a refinery with a 200,000 barrel a day plus capacity in Freeport in the Bahamas.

Economically, the location of this plant makes no sense unless its production can be imported into the United States. Much of its production will be low sulfur residual fuel oil which can enter the United States virtually without limit. However, the refinery will also produce other products such as naphtha which must be sold either in the United States or on the world market. Naturally, because of the high price of petroleum products in the United States and because of the location of the refinery the most profitable market for the refinery is in the United States.

Puerto Rico offers this Bahamian refinery access to the United States for its naphtha. Commonwealth Oil and Refining Company has an import quota into Puerto Rico of 146,047 barrels a day of crude and unfinished oils and Phillips Oil Company has an import quota of crude and unfinished oils into Puerto Rico of 50,000 barrels a day. Either company could take this naphtha, which is considered an unfinished oil, and by simply adding an octane booster make gasoline which could then be shipped into the United States. Commonwealth can ship as many as 42,928 barrels and Phillips can ship as much as 22,500 barrels a day of gasoline from Puerto Rico into the United States.

I would hate to see the oil import program used to encourage American citizens to injure our Nation’s economy. The export of capital needed to construct this Bahamian refinery is contrary to the President’s restrictions on the export of capital and will adversely affect our balance of payments at a time when every citizen should be helping to correct our balance of payments deficit. Finally, since the primary market of this Bahamian refinery is in the United States, why should not the refinery be constructed here in the United States where

many of our citizens could benefit from the new jobs created by the refinery.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1968.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: This will respond to your letter of March 29 with respect to two items relating to the Mandatory Oil Import Program.

First, your letter asks that we reexamine the decision to allow Commonwealth to ship 42,928 b/d of finished oil products from Puerto Rico to the East Coast of the United States, including 10,000 b/d of gasoline formerly shipped to the West Coast. In this regard, the current status of authorized shipments by Commonwealth is as follows:

As of April 1, 1968, I have approved for the allocation year ending March 31, 1969, the shipment by Commonwealth of 32,928 barrels of finished products (other than residual fuel oil) to Districts I-IV. The decision of December 15, 1967, to which your letter referred, anticipated that the 10,000 b/d of products authorized for shipment to the West Coast would be authorized for shipment to the East Coast under the section of the regulations (15(c)) which authorizes the Secretary to grant feedstocks for facilities in Puerto Rico which in his judgment "will promote substantial expansion of employment in Puerto Rico through industrial development." That decision has not been implemented as no application, required under the regulations, has been approved, as yet.

The shipments from Commonwealth to the West Coast came about by reason of the fact that the initial Proclamation provision (Proclamation 3693 of December 10, 1965) which intended to restrict shipments of product from Puerto Rico to the Mainland inadvertently provided for limitation of such shipments only into Districts I-IV. The need for restricting such shipments to District V was not, at the time, evident. In mid 1966, however, Commonwealth Oil and Refining Company began shipment of gasoline to District V, causing unanticipated and almost universal objections by Senator Thomas Kuchel and other responsible California officials. We succeeded in obtaining a voluntary agreement from the shipper to restrict the shipments to 10,000 b/d, with the understanding that the shipments would be terminated at the first opportunity. Accordingly, the recent Proclamation change regarding shipments from Puerto Rico to the Mainland includes limitations of shipments to District V, as well as Districts I-IV.

We are already giving close attention to the proposed Bahamian refinery and the impact it could have on the operations in Puerto Rico and on the Mainland as well. It is true that shipments of unrestricted products may not at the present time be excluded from the United States. We propose to keep this problem under close scrutiny and will take whatever action is needed to protect the national interest.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1968.

HON. STEWART UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
U.S. Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, I have long been interested in the administration of the oil import program. I think we share a common desire to see the program improved and made more equitable.

In comparing the petrochemical plant in-

puts which were claimed and allowed for the period 10/1/65 through 9/30/66 with the petrochemical plant inputs which were claimed and allowed for the period 10/1/66 through 9/30/67. I noticed some grave discrepancies. Many companies were allowed the exact amount of input they claimed in 1966, but were denied large amounts of input in 1967. While I do not have the technical expertise to say for sure whether these companies did in fact get import allocations of oil based on ineligible petrochemical plants inputs in 1966, all available evidence indicates that a great share of the input denied in 1967 was denied because it did not qualify as a petrochemical plant input although it was allowed as such in 1966.

There would seem to be no other explanation for the large amounts of disallowed input. Just to pick several obvious examples, without singling them out for any particular blame, in 1966 all the companies mentioned in Districts I through IV were allowed all the input they claimed, yet in 1967 about one-half of Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.'s input was disallowed, almost one-half of Sinclair Oil Co.'s input was disallowed, about one-fourth of Standard Oil of New Jersey's input was disallowed and in District V about two-thirds of Standard Oil of California's input was disallowed.

In the interests of fairness, why shouldn't the individual allocations of oil imports for the second half of 1968 be reduced to reflect the imports which were erroneously allowed in previous allocation periods? Why shouldn't the regulations be administered to prevent inequities? All the petrochemical companies share one pie. Why should any company, by claiming ineligible inputs, be able, at the expense of other petrochemical companies, to get a larger share of the quota than they would otherwise be entitled to?

I have listed below the companies which were allowed all their claimed petrochemical plant inputs in 1966, but were denied inputs in 1967. However, I should point out that this list is not intended to be comprehensive. This data came from the Oil Import Administration and the figures given are in barrels per day.

DISTRICTS I-IV

Company	Claimed and allowed in 1966	Claimed in 1967	Amount disallowed
Ashland Oil & Refining Co....	10,992	10,353	498
Copolymer Rubber & Chemical Co.....	2,501	2,788	426
Dow Chemical Co.....	39,830	42,939	30
Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.....	2,755	2,313	1,127
Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals.....	5,109	5,190	560
Gulf Oil Corp.....	15,089	20,436	2,196
Monsanto Co.....	48,383	52,066	1,766
Phillips Petroleum Co.....	13,724	14,543	160
Standard Oil Co.....	13,139	14,192	6,247
Sun Oil Co.....	39,661	40,533	9,235
Sinclair Oil Co.....	3,295	3,684	1,831
Texas-U.S. Chemical Co.....	6,833	6,541	634
Union Carbide Corp.....	85,518	92,782	7,938

DISTRICT V

Firestone Tire & Rubber Co..	87	89	89
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co..	29	22	22
Standard Oil of California....	4,365	3,749	2,883

I urge you to recheck the petrochemical plant inputs which were allowed for 1966 and to allocate the petrochemical oil import quota for the second half of 1968 in light of the ineligible petrochemical plant inputs which you discover were erroneously allowed. This should not be too difficult to do, since the determination of what was and was not an ineligible petrochemical plant inputs which parently made by your technical experts before they examined the petrochemical plant inputs claimed in 1967. All that needs to be done in most cases is a comparison of the materials claimed and allowed as an eligible

petrochemical plant input in 1966 with the materials claimed and disallowed as an ineligible petrochemical plant input in 1967.

Would you please advise me of the companies which received import quotas based on petrochemical plant inputs claimed in 1966 which were later determined to be ineligible and the amount of imports they received on account of such ineligible inputs? Would you also please advise me whether for the second half of 1968 you intend to lower the import quotas for those companies which received quotas based on ineligible petrochemical plant inputs so as to offset the excessive quotas they received?

I am looking forward to hearing from you shortly.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

MR. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

THE BILL CLERK proceeded to call the roll.

MR. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

A DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE— A TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, on April 5, 1968, a statement was made in this Chamber that I believe will go down in history. It was a courageous statement. It was a declaration of conscience. It went against the outpouring tide of that day and of current time.

It was a statement that could be distorted by those who disagreed with it. It was a statement that could bring reprisal and grief to its author.

It was the profound, provocative, wise and deeply moving statement of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. Because he was apparently in a great minority as far as vigorous and widespread articulation was concerned, Senator BYRD may have felt a great loneliness in his public statement.

But I want to assure him that he was not alone in his thoughts and concerns.

Many who feel as he does have not spoken out. Yet, privately they are praising him and are thankful that he has spoken out. I have heard more favorable comment on his statement than on any other Senate speech for a long time.

Today's fear and the timidity of so many to speak out for law and order and against violence—against each man determining for himself what is law, against advocacy of defiance of the law, against precepts that lead to anarchy, looting, arson, murder and treason—is reminiscent of the sickness of mental muteness that paralyzed not only this U.S. Senate but the entire Nation in the early fifties.

I have no doubt that Senator BYRD will suffer serious repercussions and castigation for his courageous statement of April 5, 1968 because I know of the repercussions and castigation I experi-

enced from my statement of June 1, 1950.

I also know how much support and words of encouragement meant to me back in those days, months, and even years, following my statement. It is in this spirit that I pay tribute to the junior Senator from West Virginia for his courageous statement.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE IN MONTANA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, increasing costs of farm machinery, labor, seed, fertilizers, and everything else have led to a growing financial risk for farmers.

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has more than doubled its scope of operation nationally over the last 6 years. Increased numbers of farmers have turned to its voluntary, all-risk, self-help program for protection of their operating capital.

The importance of this protection has increased and at the same time the credit value of carrying Federal Crop Insurance has increased even more so.

In Montana, for example, participation in Federal crop insurance has grown steadily. In 1967 total premiums paid by Montana farmers were nearly \$2½ million compared with a 20-year average of approximately \$1¼ million.

But steadily as participation in the Federal Crop Insurance program has grown in Montana, the use of this protection by insured farmers for credit purposes has grown even faster. I am told there are now nearly 350 collateral assignments of FCIC policies held by Montana financial institutions backing farm loans totalling nearly \$8 million. FCIC officials and bankers agree that for every formal collateral assignment written, perhaps 10 loans were made where the carrying of Federal Crop Insurance by the borrower was a key factor in the amount of the loan, or in the loan being made at all, even though the proceeds from the policy in the event of crop disaster were not actually pledged in writing.

In sum, Federal Crop Insurance is now serving a dual purpose as a result of the farmers' increased needs for expansion and more operating capital. I understand that the number of banks and other lending institutions now eligible to write FCIC applications has increased from zero 3 years ago to more than 800 today.

Last year Montana farmers called on FCIC for a total of only \$647,000 in crop damage loss payments. There have been bigger loss years, however. FCIC paid \$4 million to Montana farmers in 1949, \$3½ million in 1963, \$2½ million in 1961, and more than \$1 million in 1962. The 20-year average has been almost \$1 million. More than 5,000 Montana farmers in 33 counties carry about \$36½ million in FCIC protection on one or more of three crops: wheat, sugar beets, and barley. Over a period of 26 years, drought has been the big cause of crop loss in Montana, accounting for nearly 62 percent of all loss payments FCIC has made in the State. Other causes have included insects, wind, flood, hail, freeze, disease, and excess moisture.

The operation of this program has been most effective—with a national average in loss payments to farmers of 95 cents for every \$1 of premium the farmers pay in. At the same time, the credit value of Federal crop insurance to policyholders is becoming more and more evident in these times of changing conditions on the farm. I am pleased that the program established by Congress has worked out even better than we anticipated.

COOLING THE ECONOMY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in view of the present state of economic affairs, it is especially gratifying to note that throughout the country a growing number of editorialists are stating that the combination of a tax increase and expenditure reduction can no longer be delayed or blinked away.

I invite the attention of Senators to editorials on this subject which were published in the Miami Herald of April 18 and the Tampa Tribune of April 20. Both are leading newspapers in my home State of Florida.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 18, 1968]
SIGNS UNMISTAKABLE: ECONOMY NEEDS COOLING

The fire is too hot under the pot of our nation's economy. It is about to boil over, if, indeed, it hasn't already done so.

Gross National Product—the worth of all goods and services produced in the country—is the broadest measure of economic activity. The latest government report says GNP soared during the first three months of this year by \$20 billion to a record annual rate of \$827.3 billion.

This sounds as though the pot were bubbling merrily, but wait. Of that \$20-billion increase, only \$12 billion represented real growth. The rest—\$8 billion, or 40 per cent—consisted of hikes in prices, which rose in the January-March quarter at a yearly rate of 4 per cent.

Even devotees of the "new economics" concede that 4 per cent annually is too much inflation.

A few details illumine the overheating. Consumer spending accounted for \$16 billion of the \$20-billion expansion. Are Americans catching the inflation fever? It spreads when people feel that they have a fistful of money which they'd better spend at once to get what they want before the price goes up again.

Car sales rose sharply during the quarter, and for the first time sales of imported automobiles exceeded one million at an annual rate. Demand for imports can only worsen the nation's chronic balance-of-payments deficit. Balancing our international accounts is urgent to revive faith in the dollar, which, in turn, undergirds the prosperity of the whole Free World.

There is consolation—but not much—in knowing that America's industrial output reached a new high in March, the second straight monthly advance. In theory, productivity can cool inflation by making sure that there is no scarcity of goods and services to be chased by too many dollars.

Yet the rise in output last month was a mere six-tenths of one per cent over February's. The fraction compares unfavorably with that 4-per cent jump in prices.

The flame of inflation is fueled by an explosive mixture of red ink in Washington.

A major ingredient is Uncle Sam's habit of spending more than he takes in through taxes.

A slash in federal spending and a tax increase—no matter how unwelcome—are overdue. Unless this double-barreled fire extinguisher is used at once, the steam in the economy threatens to scorch us all.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune,
Apr. 20, 1968]

NO TIME TO DRAG FEET

The latest and most serious warning that the nation's economy faces destructive pressures came from a source that should command attention in the U.S. Congress, where the attention is needed rather urgently.

William McChesney Martin Jr. is chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, a man with a lifetime of experience in money management and one not easily stampeded into "viewing with alarm" when there is nothing to be alarmed about.

His words were plain.

"The United States is going to face either an uncontrollable recession or an uncontrollable inflation," he said, unless quick action is taken.

The action he proposed:

"It is absolutely imperative" that Congress both increase taxes and cut Federal spending.

The day before Mr. Martin spoke out in Washington, the Federal Reserve jumped the discount rate from 5 per cent to 5½ per cent. It was the second increase in the rate in less than two months.

This compels commercial banks to increase their prime interest rates.

Neither action immediately affects Florida citizens, but both certainly will strike at the family pocketbooks before long, when the higher cost of borrowing money will begin to show up in mortgages, installment credit charges and an increasing difficulty in finding money that dealers use to finance goods and services.

The purpose is to curb inflation.

Months ago, President Johnson called upon Congress for a surtax on income taxes to reduce the staggering Federal deficit. He has repeated the call, sounded the warning and offered a measure of economy in yielding to some Congressional demands for a lower Federal budget.

But Congress has not, as it should, applied its own paring knife to the budget, nor has it added the taxes urgently needed.

Many citizens, not understanding, may look at the spiraling price situation and wonder why they should encourage Congress to make matters worse for them by increasing taxes.

The answer is quite simply that those spiraling prices shortly would make all dollars worthless in the market place.

The national economy "grew" in the latest quarter by \$20 billion. But 40 per cent or \$8 billion represented "growth" in prices—prices that added not a single loaf of bread to anybody's table.

There are signs, too, that people are beginning to draw upon savings they had been accumulating rather rapidly in the last couple of years, signs of building pressures for retail goods and fears of a tide of imports to meet demands that U.S. producers cannot yet supply.

The case for action, now, is plain. Congress courts disaster in delaying or politicking with the Federal budget reductions or the imposition of taxes.

Individuals, too, may be called upon to exercise restraint, to apply a little of the sacrifices to personal budgets that our fighting men make overseas.

By whatever name—panic, depression or recession—millions would suffer in a collapse of the U.S. economy. Runaway inflation creates the same hardships. When the tools needed to prevent either disaster are within such easy reach, it is bewildering that Congress still drags its feet.

RHODE ISLAND LEGISLATURE APPROVES ODOMETER RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I am happy to announce that the Rhode Island Legislature on April 6, 1968, memorialized Congress to pass legislation identical to a proposal I introduced last April 26, almost 1 year ago, to require automobile manufacturers to include tamper-proof odometers on new cars. As the resolution makes clear, such a proposal would prevent unscrupulous used-car dealers from turning back the mileage indicator on cars to get a higher price.

This is but one more indication of the pressure that is building up across the Nation for a national odometer law. I hope that we can look forward to early Senate passage of my bill, S. 1621, in view of its strong national support.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE BILL 1488

A resolution memorializing Congress to require automobile manufacturers to make tamper proof odometers

Whereas, there are on occasion automobile dealers and private owners who would tamper with odometers so as to deceive purchasers of second hand cars so that they may get a higher price and that such action could be prevented by requiring automobile manufacturers to make tamper proof odometers; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the general assembly of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations through its general assembly, now requests the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will require automobile manufacturers to make tamper proof odometers; and be it further

Resolved, that the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use concerted effort to enact such legislation; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress.

Law without Approval, April 6, 1968.

ANTITRUST

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] has demonstrated at least twice in his time in this Congress the ability to detect great problems facing this Nation before most of us are aware of them. His leadership in the areas of consumer protection and civil rights has been acclaimed by many.

Therefore, I think special attention should be given to remarks he has made recently on the role antitrust should be playing in this country.

Drawing on the expertise he has developed as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, Senator HART warned us earlier that neglect of antitrust enforcement is taking this Nation away from the free enterprise system toward governmental regulation. Naturally, regulation is not a pleasant alternative in his opinion—or mine.

Several days ago Senator HART added a new chapter to his report on the state

of antitrust today and the harmful effects that are being felt by consumers because of its malaise.

He points out that if we are concerned with rising prices, with the balance-of-payment problems, with the convulsions now shaking our urban areas, we must put more emphasis on competition and antitrust. Also, he points out that whereas there seems to be some awakening to the problems of past neglect by enforcement agencies, other branches of Government—especially the State Department and Congress—are taking steps to further erode competition.

Mr. President, the significance of this speech was pointed out by the Washington Post in an editorial on April 8, 1968. I ask unanimous consent that both Senator HART's speech and that editorial be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTITRUST TODAY IS SICK

Sen. Philip A. Hart, chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee, is a mild-mannered and thoughtful man, one not given to the hyperbole in which some of his colleagues indulge. Nonetheless, he expressed his concern for the future of competition with great force in remarks before the American Bar Association, "Antitrust today is sick and nobody seems greatly concerned," he said, adding that: "What our corporate executives desire is not competition but security; not the discipline of the marketplace, but the anarchy of unrestrained pricing. In Professor Galbraith they have their apologist; in the Federal Government, I fear they have found an accomplice."

One may quarrel with Mr. HART's assertion that our principal economic problems flow from the decline of price competition which in turn is attributed to the concentration of production in the hands of fewer and larger business enterprises. Yet it is difficult to view the data on mergers without alarm or to read the recent testimony before Mr. Hart's subcommittee without concluding that much harm flows from monopolistic pricing policies.

The Federal Trade Commission reports that the number of mergers in manufacturing and mining industries rose by 50 per cent in 1967, the "sharpest increase in modern industrial history." Most of the larger mergers were of the "conglomerate" type, acquisitions which put single enterprises into a large number of unrelated industries. Many conglomerates were growing at breathtaking rates a few years ago, and their shares commanded prices that bore little relationship to prospective earnings. But now the high flyers are coming down toward earth. *Fortune* in its April issue analyzes the deep problems confronting Litton Industries, once the most dazzling of fast-merging conglomerates.

The Litton story raises the relevant question of whether general managers, no matter how talented or technically competent, "can effectively oversee diverse businesses in which they have no specific experience." Notwithstanding the advances in business reporting and communications, corporate giantism creates intractable problems of coordination and control. And with many of the new technological developments favoring the establishment of small or medium-sized firms, it is fair to ask whether the putative benefits of conglomerate corporations extend beyond underwriting and other windfall profits to those who assemble them.

The domination of an industry by a few large firms frequently results in price policies that are undesirable, not only for society, but for the price-makers as well. Prof. Egon Sohmen, an eminent German economist who

appeared before the Hart subcommittee, contrasted steel pricing policies in the United States and Western Europe in the period 1955-66. U.S. steel prices tended to be rigid and consequently adjustments to changes in demand took the form of wide swings in production. But in Europe, where prices were permitted to vary widely, production was quite steady. Mr. Sohmen believes that the uncompetitive behavior of the U.S. steel industry did much harm:

Had the industry worked at capacity during the early sixties, and had it exported the additional steel at world market prices, the additional export revenue (taking into account the fact that steel prices on the world market would have been somewhat lower as a consequence) would have eliminated the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits during these years.

Antitrust was high on the agenda of the Eisenhower Administration, but it has subsequently been permitted to fall into a state of innocuous desuetude. Its revival at this juncture would be highly salutary.

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART TO ANTITRUST SECTION, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Antitrust today is sick and nobody seems greatly concerned. Yet its illness can infect our total society, including rising prices—which we confuse with inflation—balance of payments problems and the growing alienation of a significant segment of our citizens.

What our corporate executives desire is not competition but security; not the discipline of the marketplace, but the anarchy of unrestrained pricing. In Professor Galbraith, they have found their apologist; in the Federal Government, I fear they have found an accomplice.

A wry, penetrating European authority put it very well when he told our subcommittee:

"It is extremely difficult for most people to differentiate between limited private and general social advantage. Everybody realizes perfectly well that restraints of competition by himself and his immediate competitors, everything else remaining unchanged, work to his own and to their advantage. Unless corrupted by deeper economic insight, most people will therefore do their level best to ensure that they are free to pursue this more narrow goal of group interest even though they will all be worse off in the end if everybody else engages in this game as well."

Concentrated industries remain concentrated; conglomerate mergers proliferate at record speed; enforcement remains low key and overall concentration continues to grow. Yet we know that concentrated industries can ignore supply and demand factors as they raise prices in unison; conglomerates tend to accumulate power rather than efficiency; and the flow of economic power into a few hands threatens political democracy.

This dismal picture is compounded by the fact that new technology should be taking us in another direction—toward deconcentration, greater efficiency in smaller units. But its natural thrust has been distorted—new technology has been used to rationalize the very theory it has proved to be a lie—that bigness is inevitable in a technology-oriented economy.

We forget, I think, what antitrust is all about: power—political power, social power, economic power. The interconnection is obvious. In this society of ours, we depend on diffusion of power as the best means of achieving political democracy. And this is the basic task of antitrust legislation. If we fail the danger is clear to anyone who has studied history—particularly that of the Axis Powers prior to World War II.

The antitrust laws were intended to reach each of these aspects of power. True, sec-

tion 1 of the Sherman Act is aimed at "restraints of trade." But section 2 is aimed at monopoly and attempts at monopoly even though there may be no restraint of trade. Section 7 of the Clayton Act poses two tests. One, again, is economic—"substantially to lessen competition." But the other "tend to create a monopoly" need not be.

Recognizing this multiple thrust of the antitrust laws, Senator Kefauver uttered these prophetic words in 1950:

"Local economic independence cannot be preserved in the face of consolidations such as we have had during the past few years. The control of American business is steadily being transferred, I am sorry to have to say, from local communities to a few large cities in which central managers decide the policies and the fate of the farflung enterprises they control. Millions of people depend helplessly on their judgment. Through monopolistic mergers the people are losing power to direct their own economic welfare. When they lose the power to direct their economic welfare they also lose the means to direct their political future."

There is in the antitrust law a place both for the political scientist and the sociologist in addition to the economist. Certainly antitrust enforcement needs to rest on something more than economic gamemanship.

When Congress wrote the antitrust laws it was concerned with fundamental human values. Somewhere along the way we seem to have lost sight of this fact. In this day of increasing concern over the fate of the individual—his alienation from society, his "depersonalization" and the threat posed by "power structures" and "establishments", we have forgotten that antitrust laws now on the books are tools which could be used to ease this aspect of today's critical problems. It is a doctrine that can help close the gap between the promise and reality of equal opportunity. Antitrust is a doctrine on which the old right and the new left could both agree.

We are concerned with rising prices—something must be done, the cry goes, to curb inflation. Monetary and fiscal policies are proposed to cool the economy.

But demand is not outstripping supply in most of our basic industries. Quite the contrary. Yet our programs "aimed at inflation" are based on one premise—that ours is a supply and demand economy. The history of the past decade is lost on decision makers. In one basic industry after another prices have climbed upward regardless of supply and demand considerations. So long as we have concentrated industries immunized from competitive factors, there can be no direct relationship between supply and demand and prices. But who cries out that to fight inflation we must pursue a vigorous antitrust policy? Certainly not the businessman or the Council of Economic Advisors.

The Joint Economic Committee in its 1967 report spoke clearly enough:

"Antitrust must be assigned a central role in national economic policy of no less significance than monetary and fiscal policy." But who has listened?

The President of General Electric in supporting a tax increase put it quite realistically. After speaking in favor of the proposed surtax, he said, "However, a slackening in the economy as the result of a tax increase would not remove the pressure to raise prices."

One way—although overlooked—to remove the pressure is vigorous competition among enough competitors to make lockstep pricing difficult.

We are told also we must cool off our economy because we have a balance of payments problem. I have never really understood the reasoning applied here. It seems to go this way—reducing demand will bring prices down; this will increase exports and decrease imports. But if reduced demand does

not bring down prices and selective buyers turn to cheaper foreign imports, aren't we left exactly where we started—with the additional worry of a recession?

But what of the foreign mergers consummated by American companies? These not only may have cut exports but have resulted in American companies importing products from the acquired firm. How does this movement affect our balance of payments?

If antitrust authorities had been alert to the direct impact such acquisitions might have on our commerce, would the balance of payments situation be the same today? Some authorities also have suggested that the rigid price structure of our concentrated industries may have priced us out of foreign markets, further damaging our balance of payments position.

It is easy to criticize our enforcement agencies, but I doubt if this serves a useful purpose. Indeed, they show signs of recognizing the problems caused by antitrust neglect.

What antitrust needs most is a constituency and this is precisely what it lacks. Mergers have been promoted as the solution to every industry problem. But as the *Wall Street Journal* has pointed out:

"In this general infatuation with concentration, though, no one should forget that not all corporate marriages are made in heaven. While consolidations often promote competition, they can at times tend to stifle it: the operations of some of Europe's cartels in the past are proof of that."

Yet the American people are being sold a bill of goods on the economic advantages of bigness for its own sake. When the antitrust agencies move against banks, Congress reacts by passing special legislation which wipes out pending cases. When the newspapers are threatened by an antitrust decision, even these bastions of free enterprise editorials come and ask for special dispensation. Everyone is for antitrust until it threatens their security. As long as we live by the code: "competition is fine for the other guy but not me" effective enforcement is most difficult.

The sad spectacle now occurring in the United States Congress in regard to quota legislation is further proof of the lack of a constituency for competition and the political power of large economic interests. The same companies who deplore big brotherism by government have no hesitancy in asking government intervention when faced with effective competition.

We are called a consumer Congress. Yet the basic consumer concern—price and quality—can be protected only by vigorous antitrust. And Congress has shown no stomach for demanding action in this field.

Somewhat or other the American public has not become aware of the potential for economic, political and social betterment inherent in our antitrust statutes.

Government procurement, tax policy, some Securities and Exchange procedures, regulated industry activity, particularly by the Federal Communications Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Interstate Commerce Commission and the Maritime Commission, indicate a preoccupation with protecting the "ins" at the expense of the "outs."

And the State Department has shown a distinct distaste for competitive factors. It now has two employees working full time in this area although in hearings going back at least three years before our subcommittee, it has promised to review the meager resources allotted to anticompetitive problems. Our quinine and quindine hearings documented its sometimes preoccupation with protecting and promoting cartel-like arrangements rather than competition.

More and more I am coming to the conclusion that the best hope for vigorous antitrust activity rests with the private bar. In

antitrust tradition, possibly we can chain economic self-interest to the public interest.

In the Congress I have introduced legislation to strengthen private enforcement efforts. But as yet there has been no ground swell for its passage. I shall keep trying.

However, in the long run, it may well be you who will determine the quality of competition in this country.

TAX INCREASE IMPERATIVE NOW

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, many Senators have been concerned, over a period of many months, about the growing evidence of dangerous economic expansion, coupled with other disturbing developments in fiscal and monetary affairs.

That concern was manifested when the Senate voted to approve a package which was offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and me for the purpose of combining the enactment of the 10-percent surtax with a Federal spending reduction of \$6 billion.

It has now been some 3 weeks since the Senate expressed its concern on April 2. In the intervening days, many more indices have supported the thesis that time is running out for Congress to restore balance to our economic growth and restore fiscal and monetary stability at home and abroad.

It is my hope, the Senate having already acted, that the House will see fit to initiate actions permitting the early passage of the Senate-passed bill to impose the surtax and reduce Federal spending.

There is now an urgency for action in the areas of taxation and reduction of spending which cannot be denied. In support of that thesis, I invite the attention of the Senate to two recent events, the first being an article written by Lee M. Cohn, and published in the *Washington Evening Star* of April 17; the second, the text of a speech by Arthur M. Okun, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, before the National Press Club, on April 18.

Because I believe there is much meat in both statements, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

RECORD OUTPUT INCREASE ADDS TO INFLATION SPIRAL—QUARTERLY PRODUCTION UP \$20 BILLION—PATTERN CONFIRMS WHITE HOUSE FEARS

(By Lee M. Cohn)

The economy's inflationary boom is accelerating, with a record \$20 billion rise in total production during the first three months of this year.

Gross national product—total output of goods and services—increased to a seasonally adjusted annual rate of \$827.3 billion in the first quarter from \$807.3 billion in the last quarter of 1967, the Commerce Department estimated yesterday.

The biggest element in the surge of GNP was a record \$16 billion increase in spending by consumers, who previously had helped restrain the boom by practicing an unusual degree of thrift.

Two-fifths of the GNP gain was fluff. "Real" output in terms of physical volume of goods and services increased by only 1.5 percent in the first quarter, the department

estimated, while price rises accounted for another 1 percent.

FEARS CONFIRMED

This pattern confirmed the Johnson administration's fears of worsening inflation, and undoubtedly will be used in arguing for tax boosts to slow the economy's pace.

The \$20 billion rise in dollar GNP topped the previous record of \$18.4 billion, set in the fourth quarter of 1965. But in relative terms the January-March advance of 2.5 percent fell short of the record 2.7 percent increase in October-December of 1965.

GNP was \$61 billion, or 8 percent, higher in the January-March quarter than a year earlier.

Government analysts emphasized that the estimates were based on preliminary data, and may be revised next month.

If GNP continues to increase by \$20 billion a quarter, the 1968 total will reach \$865 billion. The administration in January predicted a rise of only \$61 billion, to \$846 billion, if taxes were increased as proposed by President Johnson.

INDUSTRY OUTPUT UP

In another report yesterday, the Federal Reserve Board estimated that industrial production increased to 162.1 percent of the 1957-59 base average in March from the February index of 161.5.

Consumers last year saved an unusually large proportion of their incomes, puzzling analysts and helping to keep inflation from becoming worse than it did.

But the GNP report showed that consumers loosened their purse strings in the first quarter of 1968. They saved an estimated 6.8 percent of disposable income, down from 7.5 percent in the last quarter of 1967.

There are some indications that the saving rate may continue to decline, perhaps because consumers feel more hopeful about peace in Vietnam and less worried about tax increases.

Mainly because consumers bought so much, business inventories increased at an annual rate of only \$3.9 billion in the first quarter, compared with a \$9.2 billion rise in the fourth quarter of 1967.

Increases in consumer spending were especially notable for food, clothing, autos and furniture. Sales of imported autos reached an annual rate of 1 million cars for the first time.

Among other elements in the first quarter GNP rise were these increases:

Federal government purchases of goods and services, up \$3.5 billion to an annual rate of \$95.7 billion. This included an increase of \$2.4 billion, to \$76.6 billion, for defense.

State and local government purchases, up \$2.4 billion to \$91.9 billion.

Business fixed investment, up \$3.2 billion to \$87.2 billion.

Housing, up \$700 million to \$28.3 billion. The surplus of exports over imports declined from a \$3 billion annual rate in the last quarter of 1967 to \$2.6 billion in the January-March quarter.

CURRENT ECONOMIC ISSUES

(Remarks by Arthur M. Okun, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers, at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., April 18, 1968)

The buoyant economic news of the first quarter of 1968 could easily absorb all my time today. We had the lowest quarterly unemployment rate—3.6 percent—in more than 14 years. About 800,000 jobs were added to nonfarm payrolls. The compensation of workers soared \$14 billion. And there was plenty of income for business too: early returns on profits suggest that they topped the record set in the fourth quarter of 1967. Consumers clearly never had it so good: adjusted for price increases, real disposable income shot up 1½ percent; and this yielded a gain of about \$35 in real income per capita.

At the risk of being a kill-joy, however, I consider it my job to point out that these developments are not a sound basis for a celebration. They represent too much good news. And in our present economic situation, too much good news is bad news.

THE FRANTIC FIRST QUARTER

The gross national product expanded \$20 billion in the first quarter. This was the largest quarterly advance in our history, topping the previous record rise of \$18½ billion in the fourth quarter of 1965. This unwelcome development was no surprise. In his Economic Report for 1968, the President noted the widely-held expectations that the first quarter would register a record-breaking advance and termed it a "record we could gladly do without at this time."

Even after correction for the disturbing 4-percent annual rate of price increase, real output grew at an annual rate of 6 percent—an unsustainable pace far above the 4-percent growth rate of our productive capacity. Construction, State and local government services, and other nonmanufacturing sectors appear to have made sensational gains. The advance was somewhat more moderate in manufacturing. But even here, output rose at an annual rate near 5 percent from the fourth quarter of 1967 to the first quarter of 1968. New orders for durable goods in January and February exceeded the fourth quarter average by more than 1 percent, and total manufacturers' shipments were 3½ percent higher (not expressed in annual rates).

The most striking and significant—and most worrisome—development was the new surge in consumer spending. The \$16 billion increase in consumer outlays was by far the largest quarterly increase in history—the biggest previous jump was a mere \$11½ billion. Corrected for price increases, the annual growth rate of consumption in real terms was a fabulous 9 percent. Even though disposable income rose very rapidly during the quarter, the saving rate fell markedly from 7.5 percent to 6.8 percent of disposable income. This was a departure from the normal experience that, when income spurts, consumption tends to lag somewhat behind. To be sure, a part—although not a large part—of the jump in consumption reflected a catch-up of automobile purchases following the work stoppages of late 1967. The over-all advance in the first quarter inherited some extra strength from this legacy.

At the same time, the first quarter made its own large bequest to the future through the performance of inventories. Despite some steel stockpiling, the rate of inventory investment was an unusually low \$4 billion. Apparently, the rapid growth of final sales outran businessmen's expectations; their stocks accordingly lagged behind their expectations—as well as ours. Final sales rose \$25 billion, shattering the previous record increase of \$18 billion, and achieving a whopping 9 percent annual rate of growth in real terms. The net result is that inventory investment is likely to rise markedly in the current quarter and to show more strength throughout the rest of 1968 than was previously expected.

Just as a substantial inventory buildup seems to lie ahead of us, so the consumer's sluggishness is apparently behind us. The consumer's spontaneous restraint was the one main factor that kept the economy from going clear through the roof in the second half of 1967, and we can only regret that this moderating force faded from the scene in recent months. The saving rate is still high by historical standards, but that fact underlines the threat that it could continue to drop. We may well see a retreat in consumer buying in April associated with the recent civil disorders, but that is not likely to have a lasting economic impact. A renewed savings spree cannot be ruled out, but it surely cannot be counted on.

The few analysts who have had difficulty

imagining where the growth of demand was going to come from in the second half of this year are beginning to get their answer. It is a safe prediction that the forecasts of most economists for the remainder of 1968 are about to be marked up. And those economists who enjoy contemplating bearish possibilities will be obliged to speculate increasingly on the longer-run unknowns of 1969 and 1970.

THE SURGE SINCE MID-1967

The gains of the first quarter should be viewed, not in isolation, but as an extension and further acceleration of the economic upsurge of the second half of 1967. Since mid-1967, GNP has risen \$52 billion—the biggest dollar advance ever in three quarters—and the annual rate of real growth has been 5 percent. There are some interesting comparisons and contrasts between this latest period and the three-quarter boom from the second quarter of 1965 to the first quarter of 1966.

Both periods are marked by a sharp acceleration of prices, an upsurge in interest rates, and a worsening of our international trade position. Loosely speaking, in the 1965-66 interval, over-all price increases stepped up from a 2 percent to a 3 percent rate; key private interest rates rose between one-half and one percentage point, generally crossing 5 percent; and net exports fell from \$8 billion to \$6 billion. In the most recent interval, over-all price increases have moved from a 2-plus percent to a 4 percent rate; private interest rates have again gone up between a half and a full point and are now generally at or above 6 percent; and our net exports have nosedived from \$5½ billion to \$2½ billion. On each count, the deterioration has been at least as great in the more recent period. And because we were starting from a worse position on each front in 1967, we could not as readily afford the setbacks.

The composition of demand shows marked differences in the two periods. In the 1965-66 boom, strong pressures were concentrated in the capital goods and the defense industries; in contrast, now we have what my colleague James Duesenberry has labeled a "well-balanced excess" across the board. And because the excess is well-balanced, it may be less dramatic and less conspicuous. The fact that manufacturing is not leading the parade today may also make our excessive strength less obvious. The current situation is not an investment boom, or a defense boom, or a housing boom, or a consumer boom. But it adds up to an over-all boom. Or if it is not a boom, it is surely the most vigorous and the most dangerous non-boom that this economy has ever experienced.

One major difference between the two periods is that the current episode was fundamentally avoidable. It was predicted by economists, an adequate fiscal remedy was prescribed by the President, and legislative action could have been taken in time to hold the growth of demand to a moderate and healthy pace. In the summer and fall of 1965—even after the first supplemental budget request for Vietnam was announced—the surge that lay ahead was not accurately foreseen by the experts. In part, the speed and extent of the defense buildup were underestimated. In part, the private economy's response was not fully gauged. That fish got away from CEA and the economics profession at large—at least it eluded the hook for some months.

Again speaking for CEA and for the majority of professional economic forecasters, I can say that the most recent upsurge was caught promptly and adroitly. Fifteen months ago, our 1967 Report sketched the outlines. Last August, Gardner Ackley detailed the outlook and the case for the tax increase in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. After eight months, Ackley's analysis and the statements of most of the economists who appeared before Ways and Means read

very well today—much better than we have a right to expect in the economic outlook business. The profession may have been lucky to do so well; but the Nation was unlucky that we were right and that our advice was not heeded promptly.

Let me point out one other major difference between the two periods of upsurge. By April 1966, fiscal action had been taken to slow down the economy—not as large or as timely as would have been ideal, but nevertheless a significant move. Meanwhile, monetary policy had become sharply restrictive. As a result, a decisive economic slow-down was already in the works two years ago.

It is not in the works now. Major fiscal action is still to come. Monetary policy has been appropriately adjusted in the direction of restraint; but the Federal Reserve has wisely taken gradual measured steps, recognizing the uneven impact of an extremely tight credit policy.

In absence of tax action or a big dose of added monetary restraint, an excessive rate of economic growth would be in prospect as far as one could see out to the horizon. Fueled by a large Federal deficit at high employment and not checked by a credit squeeze, the economy would probably continue to exceed reasonable speed limits. Although not every quarter would match the \$20 billion jump of the frantic first, output would most probably continue to outpace our productive capacity and prices would keep accelerating. Ultimately, credit would be likely to tighten enough to bring demand under control; but such a development could repeat the unhappy side-effects of 1966 on homebuilding and on the course of financial markets. That act should not get an encore.

FISCAL POLICY AND PEACE

In the past few weeks, many questions about the outlook and the fiscal program have focused on the possibility of peace. These questions recognize that the need for higher taxes stems directly from our extraordinary defense expenditures in Southeast Asia. As the President has repeatedly made clear, the tax hike is required to finance the war responsibly and equitably.

Our fiscal policy, however, must be geared to the hard realities of the present wartime situation—not to our hopes and wishes for peace. And the hard realities embodied in our best current estimates for fiscal 1969 show special Vietnam budgetary costs of \$28.9 billion—\$2.6 billion above the January Budget program.

Even a complete cessation of hostilities would not, in itself, immediately or dramatically change the outlook for defense outlays and obligations or their impact on the economy. When a secure and durable settlement permits our armed forces to be withdrawn from Southeast Asia and released into civilian life, then and only then will there be a major downward movement in the defense budget. We are planning—as we are all praying—for that day. When it comes, we will be ready to seize the bright opportunities for peacetime prosperity with a timely adjustment in fiscal policy. If we should be delightfully surprised by the sudden development of a secure peace, no American would be embarrassed by an early repeal of the tax surcharge. The enactment of an urgent wartime tax increase would not lock us into an inappropriate peacetime tax policy.

DEMAND AND INFLATION

Is the tax surcharge an effective weapon against inflation? That is the key question about the fiscal program that I am asked again and again. Nearly everyone understands and agrees that the tax increase will moderate the growth of demand. What needs to be made clear is that a little extra demand makes a big difference in our price performance.

The broad contours of price movements

during the 1960's demonstrate the link between the pressure of spending and inflation. Until 1965, both consumer and over-all prices crept up at an average rate slightly above 1 percent a year; there was essentially complete stability in average industrial wholesale prices. Prices accelerated with the surge in demand in late 1965 and early 1966. Then they slowed down once again when demand paused in the first half of 1967. In that period, both consumer prices and the GNP price deflator rose at a rate of about 2 percent, and wholesale industrial prices were again on a plateau. The upswing in demand since mid-1967 has produced our present disturbing 4 percent rate of price increase.

Surely, cost-push factors account for some of our price hikes; abuses of market power are reflected in other price increases and in excessive wage increases. But these forces were operating last year too. The difference between the price record of early 1967 and that of early 1968 can be adequately summarized in one word—demand. I am prepared to attribute easily 2 percent, probably 2½ percent, and conceivably even 3 percent of our current 4-percent rate of price increase to cost-push, stressing that much of our present cost-push is the hangover from earlier demand-pull. But the remaining portion of our price increases—the acceleration—is the result of the buildup of demand pressures on our resources. When the Nation tries to spend more than it can readily produce, the excess spills over into inflation.

Our current pressures on resources may not be fully apparent to the naked eye. At least in manufacturing, the operating rates of plant and equipment are moderate. Bottlenecks and shortages are not widespread. To some extent, the very absence of significant shortages and bottlenecks reflects the fact that prices are rising. The people who are willing and able to pay higher prices are getting the goods they want and need. The employers who are willing to pay higher wages are, by and large, able to recruit labor.

Our unemployment data do, however, indicate the demand-pull pressures. The market for adult male labor is tighter today than at any time since World War II. For the more than half of our civilian labor force consisting of men of age 25 and over, the unemployment rate was 1.8 percent in March. That figure has never been lower in the 20 years that this statistic has been compiled. As of mid-1965, it was 2.7 percent; it was 2.3 percent in March 1966. That rate has been under 2.0 percent for the past 4 months in a row. Only in two months from 1948 through mid-1967 was the unemployment rate for men below 2 percent.

It may seem surprising that the unemployment rate for men is lower now than during the Korean war, even though the over-all unemployment rate is not nearly as low. Recently, improved employment opportunities have attracted women and young people into the labor force in large numbers. Unemployment is substantial among these groups, and statistically this prevents a sharp decline in over-all unemployment. The increased participation of women in the work force is not merely a statistical phenomenon: it does genuinely help to relieve pressures on labor markets. Still, women and youths are not fully substitutable for men in many jobs.

The battle for price stability must be waged on many fronts; these include enlisting the cooperation of management and organized labor, breaking bottlenecks and improving structural efficiency throughout the economy, and educating the public on the importance of making the turn toward price stability. But the battle cannot be won without bringing demand under control. Surging demand has been the cause of accelerating prices; moderation of demand is the main element in the remedy. And the tax surcharge is the key to moderating demand.

The tax surcharge will not stop inflationary tendencies in their tracks. Today's demand-

pull will be tomorrow's cost-push. But the sooner demand-pull is ended, the sooner price increases can decelerate. Moderation of demand will permit a turnaround—a decisive first step on the road back from an unacceptable 4 percent rate of price increase to reasonable price stability at high employment.

We have already seen the costs of delay build up gradually to a huge sum. This is not a case where the next straw is likely to break the camel's back. A better analogy may be a fat lady munching candy. Nobody can promise her a lovely figure overnight if she stops nibbling. Nobody can legitimately warn her that one more piece would do incalculable damage. And foregoing the candy means sacrificing a lot of fun in the short run. But the more she overindulges, the more serious the risks become. The time to stop our economic overindulgence is now.

Speaking autobiographically for a moment, I feel a strong personal commitment to the proud tradition of CEA when I argue the case for a rational fiscal policy. The stabilization policies of the past 7 years have made an important contribution to the Nation's outstanding record of economic growth and prosperity. The policies applied since 1961 have been far from perfect: they lagged behind when stimulus was needed in 1962 and 1963; they lagged on the side of restraint in 1965-66, and again in recent months. But the successes far outweigh the shortcomings.

Most important, the fiscal policies recommended by the Council and adopted by the President have faced up realistically to the twin economic dangers of inadequate demand and excessive demand. When the so-called "New Economics" was born in the Heller Council, our sluggish economy needed stimulus. But even then it was clearly recognized that the sky was not the limit. The goal was to achieve the fullest possible utilization of resources without sacrificing essential price stability. The original employment goal set by the Heller Council was a 4-percent unemployment rate—an interim target which could be made more ambitious if our price performance at high employment proved to be satisfactory.

In fact, our price performance has not been acceptable in recent years. In October 1966, my predecessor Gardner Ackley delivered the verdict that additional stimulus to over-all demand would have unacceptable inflationary consequences and was not the appropriate way to push down unemployment further. To deal with the remaining unemployment, he argued, the Nation must rely on manpower policies pinpointed at the hard-core jobless. That verdict remains thoroughly valid today.

The "New Economics" can work both ways on demand—for restraint as well as for stimulus. Indeed, it must work both ways. It is our political process that is challenged to make effective a responsive and responsible two-way fiscal policy.

International Aspects

Our present balance of payments situation dramatically underlines the need for responsible restraining fiscal policies. Without action on taxes, we would face serious risks on the international monetary front, and these in turn could imperil our prosperity. I have stressed the domestic reasons for combating inflation, however, because these are in themselves sufficient and compelling. This Nation surely is capable of practicing good economic policies on its own, quite apart from the pleas of international bankers or the nightmare of a world monetary crisis.

The President's program of fiscal restraint is not a sacrificial offering to foreign financiers. Rather it is a program to insure a sound and durable American prosperity, which will therefore strengthen our balance of payments. As the President recently put it: "The steps that we must take to convince the world are exactly the steps we must take to

sustain our own economic strength here at home."

The picture of a soggy U.S. economy being put through the wringer for balance of payments reasons comes straight out of a fairytale. The tax increase should help us to correct for our recent overindulgence, but it is not putting the economy on a starvation diet. It will permit the solid growth we want and need. For the second half of 1968, we should be aiming at a moderate growth rate somewhat smaller than the growth of our potential. We need that moderation to achieve a timely turn toward price stability. It is a prudent investment in the foundation of our prosperity for the years ahead.

If Congress promptly enacts the President's 10% surcharge proposal, we should be able to enjoy good economic news without major worries about too much good news. And as a tiny personal fringe benefit of the tax increase, I would certainly enjoy the opportunity to devote my public remarks to other issues of economic policy.

FEDERAL BUDGET RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, you and I and many other citizens have just been through the annual exercise of computing and paying our individual income taxes to the Federal Government. Coincidentally, the Council of Economic Advisers has issued its April report of "Economic Indicators."

Among the statistical information contained in this publication are tables on page 36 which show the sources of Federal budget receipts and show Federal expenditures by function. It is interesting to note that in every year since 1958—the year in which the statistics begin—receipts from individual income taxes have been exceeded by expenditures for national defense—and this does not include interest paid on the national debt which is caused primarily by war and defense.

I think that if the people of America would become aware that every penny of individual income taxes they pay is spent for war and defense, our political leaders might be persuaded to pursue public policies designed to seek peace and to minimize our participation in foreign conflicts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that portions of the tables I have mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In billions]

	Individual income taxes	National defense expenditures
Fiscal year:		
1958.....	\$34.7	\$44.5
1959.....	36.7	46.7
1960.....	40.7	45.8
1961.....	41.3	47.5
1962.....	45.6	51.2
1963.....	47.6	52.2
1964.....	48.7	53.7
1965.....	48.8	49.6
1966.....	55.4	56.8
1967.....	61.5	70.1
1968.....	67.7	76.5

RECENT ADDRESS BY MRS. ANNA ROOSEVELT HALSTED BEFORE IMPORTANT INTERNATIONALISTS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, our country has long shown its concern for

the dignity of man. It has served as a source of inspiration to other freedom-seeking peoples in other lands.

One of the distinguished Americans now serving on the President's Commission for the Observance of the International Human Rights Year is Mrs. Anna Roosevelt Halsted, vice chairman of the group. She is working to help to keep the world more aware of the need to ratify the human rights conventions and logically affirm our Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

Mrs. Halsted, selected earlier this year by President Lyndon Johnson to the Commission, presented on April 9 an exemplary report of that organization's efforts in the crusade for the universal recognition of human dignity and human rights. She appeared at a meeting of United Nations representatives of the Council of Organizations, U.N.A.-U.S.A., in New York City.

Her message coupled with her broad knowledge in the field of human rights qualifies her for her role in this search for better understanding of the principles of human rights.

Therefore, Mrs. Halsted's views deserve to be read and considered by all persons concerned with this most important subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY MRS. ANNA ROOSEVELT HALSTED TO ANNUAL PLENARY LUNCHEON MEETING CONFERENCE OF U.N. REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COUNCIL OF ORGANIZATIONS, U.N.A.-U.S.A., APRIL 9, 1968, CARNEGIE INTERNATIONAL CENTER, NEW YORK CITY

I am grateful for this invitation to address this hard-working group of important internationalists, and for your support of the goals of the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year 1968.

I believe that all of us feel very humble today and have done so since last Thursday evening's tragedy when Dr. King was killed: humble because of the emotional realization of what Dr. King stood for in our own hearts, minds and hopes, and humble because we were reminded too forcefully that there are not many of us in this world who can truthfully say that they have completely and selflessly lived their convictions 24 hours a day, day in and day out.

At the 1966 White House Conference to Fulfill These Rights Mrs. King said: "When you feel what you are doing is right, you are ready for the rough times when they come, and you face them and accept them. You learn too, that the bad times do not last forever and you know that they are part of the price you must pay for the privilege of standing by your convictions."

These words spell courage but they also emphasize moral integrity in a world where too many human beings have grown cynical and aloof through complications of learning to live with ever-growing technological developments—developments which are touching the lives of almost all human beings throughout the world; developments which must be matched with human rights in their broadest sense if we are not to become lopsided and unbalanced.

As you know we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, one of the first acts of the United Nations to fulfill the promises made in San Francisco concerning human rights and one in which my mother played a vital role. My interest and

concern in Human Rights Year stems from the influence of both of my parents who worked throughout their lifetimes for human dignity and equal opportunity for mankind at home and abroad. It also stems from the historical fact that our country is founded on the principle of human rights on a universal scale.

Thomas Jefferson expressed this faith when he predicted that the "fire of freedom and human rights" from American shores would be "lighted up in other regions of the earth."

Our last five American presidents have reaffirmed this belief in the inter-relationship between international human rights and American national interest.

This year President Johnson in signing the Executive Order establishing the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year 1968 declared: "We can lead by example. Peace is the spur. If nations are not to rely forever on a fragile balance of fears they must find confidence in making justice the guiding principle of their national and international affairs."

The purpose of this commemoration, in the words of President Johnson is "to use this occasion to deepen our commitment to the defense of human rights and to strengthen our efforts in a full and effective realization both among our own people and among all peoples of the United Nations." I do not need to remind you that there is considerable effort required on both scores—at home and abroad.

"Where, after all, do universal human rights begin?" My mother posed this question in a speech in 1958 and she answered it this way: "In small places, close to home—so close and so small that they cannot be seen on any map of the world. Yet they are the world of the individual person; the neighborhood he lives in; the school or college he attends; the factory, firm or office where he works. Such are the places where every man, woman and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere. Without concerted citizen action to uphold them close to home, we shall look in vain for progress in the larger world."

A seventy-five year old friend of Mother's phoned me from her hospital bed last Sunday evening (just hours before she was to have one leg amputated because of gangrene caused by years of diabetes) to say that she found herself continually thinking of Mother and the many times she had heard Mother warn that unless this country moved faster than it was to rectify the economic and social problems existing in our inner cities that violence such as most people could not even imagine happening here would occur.

Now, ten years after Mother answered her own question, we are still seeking to reach that world of the individual person—we are trying in the crowded urban areas of our own country as well as in the fields of other lands around the world, through economic aid and know-how.

The President's Commission, charged with creating a better understanding of the principles of human rights, can aid in that search to reach the individual person.

This is a tall order. But it is not an impossible one.

We are still faced with the barriers of resistance built up over the years—sometimes through misunderstanding, ignorance, or prejudice, sometimes through our own mistakes.

Dr. Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish economist and sociologist, whose book of 30 years ago "An American Dilemma" anticipated the racial conflicts of today, has a new book called "Asian drama: an inquiry into the poverty of nations." In it, Mr. Myrdal describes the Americans of today as powerful and dan-

gerous strangers, they are "white devils," a concept he says, with a long tradition in the Asia of which he writes.

In our own backyard, we know too well the explosive violence of peoples denied their inherent rights—their human rights if you will—through discriminatory barriers that lock them into despair and hopelessness.

One of the strongest of these barriers at home is the economic one—the barrier that keeps people from decent jobs because of the color of their skin or their national origin or their religion or their sex.

We have a law on the statute books—Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964—which prohibits discriminatory employment practices—but it takes more than a law as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission which administers that law can substantiate.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission held hearings in New York City last January to explore why companies producing so great a share of the Nation's goods and services are producing so little in terms of equal employment opportunities.

With a few notable and encouraging exceptions, EEOC found that industry's contribution has largely been limited to paper compliance, paper pledges and future intentions.

Despite a high concentration of Negro, Puerto Rican and Jewish workers, the leading white collar industries have largely ignored this valuable minority resource.

Lagging behind in our own country in terms of human rights, we are reinforcing in the eyes of the world the unfortunate picture as portrayed by Dr. Myrdal, by inaction on universal rights proposals.

Encouraging internationally is the fact that the Universal Declaration has now become what is known as a part of Customary International Law which means that when a law becomes custom (a custom within a country) it tends to automatically become binding.

The UN has also developed more specific human rights conventions, including conventions against genocide, slavery, and forced labor, the convention on the political rights of women and the convention on elimination of racial discrimination and against religious intolerance.

But agreements—just like laws—are effective only when they are implemented.

Usually we think in terms of righting a wrong with the familiar phrase—"there ought to be law." And we undertake to organize and make speeches and write to the Congress and letters to the editor urging legislative action. But once the law is passed, too many Americans assume that they have achieved their goal—that the power of the law will right the wrong or prevent a wrong.

It just doesn't work that way.

Laws—agreements—conventions must be carried out on a day to day basis, for the task of securing the rights of the people is never finished and we can never claim to have achieved perfection. Accepting this day to day task also means accepting the close correlation between human rights at the international level and human rights and civil rights at home.

In countries without a long tradition of human rights, international conventions can serve as a guide to achievement of human rights.

Here at home, the ratification of human rights conventions, coupled with strong measures to ameliorate our own difficulties, will show other countries that we mean what we say; that the United States is not only founded on the principles of universal rights but that it also continues to perfect freedom within its own boundaries. Action on such a dual purpose program can have far-reaching effects in our search for peace at home and abroad.

Other nations have been ratifying conventions over the years but not the United States.

Genocide has been made an international crime by 71 nations.

Forced labor by 78; slavery by 70. Out of 122 Member States in the United Nations, only eight have failed to ratify any human rights convention. The United States is next to the bottom of the list having finally ratified the convention against slavery last December.

As you know, in 1963, a new effort got under way with the formation of a coalition of 51 organizations to urge the U.S. to rejoin the movement that we ourselves had started in 1776. And they made impressive progress.

Nevertheless, the Genocide Convention has been before the Senate since 1949, so has the convention on Freedom of Association and Right to Organize. The Senate has had before it since 1963 the Conventions on Political Rights for Women and the Convention concerning the Abolition of Forced Labor.

Still not submitted to the Senate for ratification are the Convention on Discrimination in respect to Employment and Occupation (adopted in 1958), the Convention on Equal Remuneration for Men and Women for work of Equal Value (adopted in 1960), the Convention against Discrimination in Education, and the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination—adopted by the General Assembly in 1965 and signed by the United States as a UN member nation.

With this still unfinished business to face, we must also face the fact that "human rights" have taken on new dimensions in this year of 1968. In addition to the most obvious human rights needs among our minorities and poor are others which affect us all but about which we do little. A few of these are:

Radioactive wastes from atomic power plants may be unleashing a Pandora's box of poison.

Air pollution from our industrial society—and water pollution that is sealing off our rivers and lakes from recreational activities, and the preservation of wild life are all a part of that world of the individual person where universal human rights begin.

Such issues are raised by scientific and technological developments and may soon reach the danger stage not only in terms of our own country but in terms of our international relations. We have only to recall the controversy that developed over the hydrogen bomb accidentally dropped from a U.S. plane off the coast of Portugal or the equally dangerous situation when we lost nuclear warheads around Iceland.

The important role of organizations such as yours was clearly illustrated at the UN's founding conference when pressure from the people asserted through their group and organization leaders compelled the statesmen who were drafting the UN charter to include the commitment to protect human rights. That commitment, however, unless it is brought home in continuous and meaningful ways to people in this country as well as throughout the world is merely a paper pledge.

We as citizens speaking through our voluntary organizations must convince our duly elected representatives to translate this commitment into practice. This means educating public opinion about human rights conventions. It means convincing the Senate to proceed with the unfinished business of ratifying the conventions.

Educationally it means that the UN and human rights must come to life as a day to day process of living: come to life for school children as well as their parents. There is much to be proud of in our history and accomplishments. The task is to find the way, as we teach, to bring together the past, the present and the possibilities for the future—relating all this to the responsibilities of

each citizen, not only to learn but also to act.

All of these are problems which offer challenges to the President's Commission. At its first meeting some of these were discussed. At our meeting next week there will be reports from those members who have been most active, and further plans will get underway. One point came out clearly at the first meeting: that was the importance for members of the Commission to work through and with organizations such as yours; with those of you who are at the United Nations as well as with members of your organizations who work in human rights fields at all levels at home.

Whatever may be the answer to the many problems we face today both at home and abroad "business as usual" is not the way to solve them.

We might well say that the year 1968, marking the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is a good time to begin.

SMALL BUSINESS EXPORT TRADE CORPORATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for the past couple of weeks I have been receiving calls from the press, from Members of Congress, from interested businessmen, and from a wide variety of sources concerning reports that I intend soon to introduce a bill providing for the development of structures to be known as Small Business Export Trade Corporations. Much of the interest has derived from an article by H. J. Maidenberg in the New York Times of April 14 entitled "Small Units for Exports Suggested."

As the Times article notes, the basis upon which the bill is being drafted is the considerable experience, over some 15 years, of Eugene M. Lang, of the Resources & Facilities Corp. Mr. Lang originally conceived the outlines of the proposal several years ago and on April 10, 1963, discussed it before the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives.

In order that my colleagues may be more fully aware of the nature of the legislation I intend to offer, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Maidenberg's article may appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL UNITS FOR EXPORTS SUGGESTED

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

A bill aimed at alleviating the nation's balance-of-payments problem and also introducing small business to the advantages of overseas trade is being prepared by Senator Vance Hartke, Democrat of Indiana.

It would group five or more small and intermediate-size manufacturers into Small Business Export Trade Corporations. These units, modeled partly on existing Small Business Investment Corporations, would then receive most of the benefits available to larger concerns engaged in foreign trade.

The idea was developed by Eugene M. Lang, president of the Resources and Facilities Corporation (REFAC), several years ago. Mr. Lang, interviewed here the other day, declared:

"Under the past and present Administrations, proposals for export expansion have, in a practical sense, almost always completely ignored the vast potential offered by the products and know-how of more than 200,000 small businesses.

"The thinking of policy makers has been

and still is big business oriented. What will help the overseas programs of industrial giants does not solve the difficulties that keep small manufacturers from foreign markets. Small business problems cannot be solved in big business terms."

COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY

Based in large measure on REFAC's 18 years of representing small business interests in many foreign lands, the Small Business Export Trade Corporations should assure the units suitable operating facilities and staff on a capital investment of at least \$100,000.

Mr. Lang said the SBETC, "operating at its own risk and expenses, would have complete export responsibility for its clients; negotiate and administer all license and joint-venture projects, and police the overseas work and interests of clients."

Any legislation, Mr. Lang continued, should provide for any capital losses to be deducted from ordinary income by SBETC investors under the same procedures followed by Small Business Investment Corporations.

In addition, SBETC profits would be taxed at Western Hemisphere corporation rates (38 per cent), except for profits on exports to member countries of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades.

Foreign income blocked abroad should not be taxable until it could be repatriated. Such funds, Mr. Lang said, could be invested in the licensed or joint ventures (and only in such enterprises) producing the blocked income.

Other features of the proposed legislation, which is also being studied by some members of the House, would permit the creation of a bad debt reserve of up to 50 per cent of the uninsured and unsecured amounts of export receivables at the end of each fiscal year, to a maximum of \$50,000 for each SBETC member in the unit.

Mr. Lang noted that many overseas ventures often do not require any financial outlays. "A joint venture can often be set up abroad with only the investment of know-how," he explained. "REFAC has participated—and learned from its mistakes—by helping several hundred small manufacturers to license or assemble their products, or engage in joint ventures in 31 lands, developed and undeveloped, since 1952."

"The total dollar feedback to our country from dividends, royalties, engineering fees and profits since then is more than \$100-million," he said. As participants in these ventures abroad, REFAC grosses about \$6-million a year.

EXAMPLE CITED

Most small manufacturers cannot afford or do not know how to establish themselves in foreign markets, he said. "One outfit was ready to sell copies of a product design to a Japanese concern for \$25,000. They thought the deal was terrific—\$25,000 for photostats. No thought was given to the possibility that the product could eventually be sold in this country."

REFAC's Tokyo office learned of the deal, Mr. Lang went on, and made an arrangement under which the manufacturers now receive 4 per cent of the Japanese concern's sales of the product on a royalty basis, after having received \$100,000 as an initial payment.

RICHARD M. NIXON SPEAKS WITH COURAGE AND CANDOR

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the courage and candor which have marked the recent statements by Richard M. Nixon deserve the attention and commendation of all thoughtful Americans of both parties.

At a time when presidential aspirants

are scurrying across the face of America, each seeking to outpromise the other with pledges of billions of Federal dollars committed to the problems of the cities, Dick Nixon's blunt refusal to join the game is as praiseworthy as is his exposure of such promises as "dishonest and a cruel delusion."

No segment of our society, Mr. President, will more quickly recognize the rightness of Mr. Nixon's stand than the responsible leaders of the Negro community. They understand that the bitterness and frustration which has flared into violence, looting, arson, and murder have in part resulted from unfulfilled and unfulfillable promises—promises cynically made in the name of political expediency.

It is a serious matter, Mr. President, to break a promise; but it is a greater fault to make a promise which cannot be redeemed.

At the same time, Mr. Nixon has called for an \$8 billion cut in the Federal budget to prevent this Nation from "hurtling down the path toward the worst economic crisis of the postwar period."

Clearly, Dick Nixon has taken a long, hard look at two of the major problems imperiling America and has reached some hard conclusions. He recognizes that the social and economic ills which beset the Nation's cities must be cured, but he rejects the massive dosage of Federal dollars which can only raise new false hopes which have already been dashed "on the concrete of reality."

And he recognizes that unless there is a severe limitation by the President on Government spending the country faces what William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has termed "uncontrollable recession or uncontrollable inflation."

It is significant that Mr. Nixon insists that the President must assign the places where the budget is to be cut. This accords with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 and with our system of Government. The President occupies the one seat in Government from which such readjustments can be made; only he has all the facts, only he can weigh the relative urgency of thousands of programs; only he can assign meaningful priorities.

No single Member of the Congress and no committee or group of committees is in a position to make such recommendations. It is the responsibility of the President. If he shirks it, as Mr. Nixon reminds us, history will not judge him kindly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, news accounts of Mr. Nixon's two remarkable speeches over the past weekend, together with an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday which couples the grave warnings of Chairman Martin with those of Mr. Nixon and concludes:

Comments such as these add up to an unpopular version of the state of the union. But we think it is a responsible version. Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that it will be the little people—the poor and those living on savings and pensions—who will suffer most cruelly if the warnings go unheeded and if the dire prophecies are fulfilled.

There being no objection, the articles

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1968]
POOR-AID PROMISES IRK NIXON—SAYS NEEDED ARE MISLED BY POLITICIANS
 (By Ward Just)

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., April 20.—Richard M. Nixon asserted today that politicians' promises of billions to rebuild America's cities were "dishonest and a cruel delusion" and declared he would not join in that game "whether it costs the election or not."

He made it clear he supported programs to aid the poor, but said that large Federal outlays were not now feasible. He said that such programs "made good headlines" but until the time came when money could be diverted from the Vietnam war he would not join the "parade of candidates" offering dollar solutions.

At a press conference prior to a meeting with Minneapolis business and industrial leaders, the former Vice President named Democrat Sens. Robert F. Kennedy and Eugene J. McCarthy as examples of politicians who have made such promises.

He said he did not know the position held by Republican Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller. On Thursday before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, Rockefeller proposed expenditures of \$150 billion over the next 10 years for urban reconstruction.

Nixon put his remarks in the context of what he called "one of the greatest financial crises in our history." He implied that the economy could not support the kind of proposals his opponents were suggesting.

Echoing a favorite line of former Republican presidential candidate George Romney, the Michigan Governor, Nixon said that money alone would not improve the lot of Negroes.

What was required for the Negro, he said, was a sense of "dignity" which would come with "respect" from the white community.

"I am not prepared to say that we should give the Negro a certain program in order to buy his allegiance," he said.

He spoke of the "family budget," which he contended would erode as the dollar weakened. "I am not going to join those candidates who are promising more and more billions."

At another point he said: "I am going to tell it like it is."

Nixon asserted that Negroes with whom he has talked agree with him. "Negro leaders know they have been taken to the mountain top only to look into the valley of despair."

The former Vice President, now the only announced candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, appeared by his remarks to foreclose the possibility that he would propose any massive Federal urban programs in an election year in which the urban crisis is a principle campaign issue.

His remarks came as he embarked on his first extensive campaign swing since President Johnson's withdrawal on March 31 and the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. on April 4.

When President Johnson announced the bombing restrictions over North Vietnam and the prospect of peace talks, Nixon said he would observe a "moratorium" on criticism of the Administration; he has been virtually silent on the subject since then.

This campaign swing will take him through eight states, all of them with Republican Governors. He met yesterday with Romney and will continue through North Dakota, Wyoming, Nevada, Oregon, Idaho and South Dakota after he leaves Minnesota.

The object is to enlist the support of the Governors and their delegations to the Republican National Convention. Nixon and his associates are telling the Governors that the former Vice President is a certain winner in

the convention, and the time to get on the bandwagon is now.

Evidence to support this view is a new Gallup poll, which was distributed to newsmen by Nixon staffers today. The poll, taken the week following the Johnson withdrawal, the King murder and the commencement of rioting, shows Nixon winning over McCarthy, Kennedy and Vice President Humphrey.

Nixon backers were jubilant over their man's performance Friday at the ASNE meeting in Washington. Nixon gave a virtuoso performance in a question and answer session before a panel of editors.

These events are cited to contradict the talk that "Nixon can't win" and to convince the fence-sitters that the campaign, now being conducted with no opponents is gaining in momentum.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 21, 1968]

**NIXON ASSAILS "PIE IN SKY" PROMISES
FOR GHETTO DWELLERS**
(By Nathan Miller)

MINNEAPOLIS, April 20.—Richard M. Nixon said today he would rather lose the presidency than delude Negroes into believing "pie in the sky" massive Federal spending on urban programs is imminent.

"For any candidate or political leader to come before the American people and tell a group of the poor . . . that the Federal Government is massively increasing its spending programs now is dishonest and renders a cruel delusion," he told a news conference.

"I am just not going to join in that game whether it costs the election or not," Nixon declared at the start of a week-long, seven-state campaign swing through the Mid and Far West.

FINANCIAL CRISIS

Pointing to statements by William McChesney Martin, Jr., chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, that the nation faces its worst financial crisis since 1931, Nixon said Federal spending should be cut rather than expanded.

Instead, he emphasized the need for more private spending to bring homes, schools and jobs to the Negro ghettos suggested the Government emphasize self-help programs and cited a "peace dividend" that could be applied to these problems if the Vietnam war begins to deescalate.

While the Republican presidential candidate carefully refrained from naming Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, who is showing signs of challenging him, among those making promises of massive aid, such criticism was obviously implied.

THE \$150 BILLION PLAN

On Thursday, the New Yorker unveiled a \$150,000,000,000 ten-year plan to meet the urban crisis which Rockefeller blamed on "the deep confusion of our priorities and the neglect of national needs."

Nixon included the Democratic candidates—Senators Robert F. Kennedy (D., N.Y.) and Eugene J. McCarthy (D., Minn.), who have announced, and Vice President Humphrey, who has yet to formally enter the race—among those making promises which can't be fulfilled.

The candidate said he had talked with Negro leaders about the problems of the cities and found them "disillusioned with pie in the sky" promises of reform that do not materialize.

"They want to hear it as it is," he declared. "They want to see it as it is. I'm going to tell them about it as it is."

Nixon said the problem facing the Negro is much deeper than the "litany of more jobs, housing and education . . . it is a problem of dignity, of their desire for respect . . . there is no easy gimmick to resolve these problems."

The former vice president, who had been expected to campaign on his experience in foreign affairs, has been faced with the problem that the main issue of this campaign

is likely to be the urban crisis that has flared into racial turmoil and is trying to establish a position.

At today's press conference and following a three-hour private talk last night with Gov. George Romney, a Rockefeller supporter, at the Michigander's home, Nixon hit hard on the proposition that the Federal Government is in no position to undertake reform programs that require massive spending.

POSSIBILITY REMOTE

"We both as realists recognize that the possibility in the immediate future of massive infusions of money into the problems of our cities is remote," Nixon had said, and Romney agreed.

"There is going to be a great deal of money spent. But it's a delusion to tell people who are living in the ghettos that billions in new money is going to flow into the ghettos in the next few months."

Today, Nixon said he would not comment on Rockefeller's \$150,000,000,000 program until he had seen more of the details. He also accused Kennedy of trying to appropriate such Republican programs as tax incentives to business and industry wishing to improve ghetto conditions, saying "I'm glad he's seen the light."

FIGURE TOO LOW

In the long run, Nixon said the \$150,000,000,000 figure set by Rockefeller may be too low, adding that perhaps \$500,000,000,000 to \$750,000,000,000 in both Federal and private capital will be needed by the cities over the next third of the century.

Following the press conference, Nixon, buoyed up by the favorable reception given his appearance yesterday before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, Nixon met privately with business, industrial and professional leaders.

Representative MacGregor (R., Minn.), his local campaign manager, said Nixon discussed the problems of the cities and methods to "energize" private enterprise to provide jobs and houses for ghetto dwellers.

MacGregor said Nixon's statements were "well received" by his audience, which totaled about 90 persons.

Tonight the candidate spoke at a Young Republicans dinner at Moorhead, Minn., where he again stressed his approach to solving urban problems and the need for party unity.

His aides were quick to point out that Nixon's speech and answers to questions had been greeted with repeated applause while Rockefeller's urban reform speech the day before had been greeted with almost universal silence.

While he received an enthusiastic airport reception last night from a small group of followers who braved a torrential downpour, there were no Minnesota Republican leaders on hand.

Political leaders in Minnesota—as elsewhere—are staying "loose" according to local political observers, although straw polls are said to show Nixon is the preferred candidate among Minnesota Republicans.

But Gov. Harold L. Vander is a member of the newly formed Rockefeller for President Committee and most of the candidates for the State's 26 delegates to the national convention are said to be uncommitted. The Governor, now in Hawaii, is one of the few governors Nixon will see during this trip.

In the face of the lukewarm reception that has greeted his candidacy, Nixon has emphasized party unity in the face of the blood-letting among the Democrats.

"From Rockefeller on the left to Goldwater on the right, it is the desire of all Republicans to unite at this time," he told newsmen.

[From the Sunday Star, Apr. 21, 1968]

NIXON—NO GHETTO PROMISES

MINNEAPOLIS.—Richard M. Nixon said yesterday he would rather lose the presidential

election than promise immediate and massive aid programs to the poor in America. He called such promises "dishonest and a cruel delusion."

He said not only Negroes but all ghetto dwellers in the nation have been misled.

Answering a question at a news conference in Minneapolis, Nixon said:

"What we are talking about now is an immediate financial crisis. And for any candidate or any political leader to come before the American people and tell a group of the poor, a group of people living in poor housing, a group of people who want jobs, that right now the federal government is going to massively increase its spending program—that's dishonest and it's a cruel delusion to whom it's told."

"And I'm just not going to join that game, whether it costs the election or not."

At another point Nixon said, "And at this time I, for one, am simply not going to join this parade of candidates who come before the American people with promises of billions in spending now when it just isn't in the cards."

Nixon described his own programs for the poor, referring to job banks, and his contention that the more immediate and realistic solution is to bring private enterprise into the ghettos, providing jobs for Negroes, "and not just menial jobs, but as managers and directors."

He was asked if he had discussed this matter with Negro leaders. He said he had and that their reaction to his ideas was "very favorable." Nixon said:

"When they speak privately they are greatly disillusioned with this pie-in-the-sky approach. Negro leaders know that they have been taken to the mountain top and then have looked into the valley of despair."

Nixon referred several times to what he called the "greatest financial crisis of this century." He said it is necessary now to cut the federal budget, not to increase it.

He added that the Negroes should be spoken to with "candor" and be told "what we can do and what we cannot. I think they want to hear it as it is and see it as it is."

Nixon expressed the view that the promises of large-scale aid to the poor, which he said were "unrealistic," had contributed to the frustrations and thus indirectly to the recent riots.

Nixon came into Minnesota late Friday night. A Minnesota politician said straw votes taken in 77 of the state's 87 counties indicated Nixon is far ahead of other potential Republican candidates. "He ran ahead of everybody in two-thirds of the counties and drew 60 per cent of the vote," the source said.

ONE FIGHT AVOIDED

As Nixon was speaking, his Minnesota backers at a district GOP convention in Willmar dropped earlier plans to seek an endorsement for him, said they would settle instead for a straw vote among the delegates, which they said they expected to win. Nixon backers said the request to avoid an endorsement fight had come from Nixon himself.

Nixon is on a tour of Midwest and Mountain states which takes him next week to Oregon. The Oregon primary will provide the first test of his strength against Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York and Gov. Ronald Reagan of California, whose names also are on the ballot. From Minneapolis, Nixon was scheduled to move on to Fargo, N.D. and neighboring Moorhead, Minn., where he speaks to a two-state young GOP meeting.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 22, 1968]

**NIXON CALLS CUT IN BUDGET VITAL—SAYS
ONLY JOHNSON ACTION CAN AVERT CRISIS**

(By Nathan Miller)

CHEYENNE, Wyo., April 21.—Richard M. Nixon today challenged President Johnson to cut the Federal budget by \$8,000,000,000 to prevent the United States from "hurtling

down the path toward the worst economic crisis of the postwar period."

The candidate for the Republican presidential nomination said in a statement shortly after his arrival here that the President should accept responsibility for earmarking the cuts to be made or face an indictment by history.

CONGRESS WILL FOLLOW

"In candor, we cannot expect that kind of leadership from a Congress very much in the political arena and halfway into an election year," Nixon declared. "But if the President will take the lead, the Congress and the country will follow."

Nixon, on the second day of an eight-day "soft-sell" campaign swing through the Middle and Far West, said "the Alphonse and Gaston act" that has gone on between the President and Congress over budget cuts "must end now and the President must end it . . ."

PRESSURE MOUNTS

"If he refuses, then history will not exonerate his abdication of leadership by blaming Congress for not cutting the President's budget. History will indict Lyndon Johnson for failing to do what he was elected to."

Pressure is building up on Congress to take action on the long-stalled 10 per cent income tax surcharge sought by the Administration as an anti-inflation weapon, but congressional leaders have been holding out for limitations on Federal spending before enacting it.

NOT REALISTIC

Nixon added that the proposed tax increase is by itself not enough to strengthen the nation's fiscal structure. If voted independently of sharp cuts in spending, he said, it will not succeed in doing the job.

Nixon combined the demand for presidential budget trimming with what has been a recurrent theme—the need for decreases in Federal spending to restore fiscal soundness. "Rules out any new vast outpouring of Federal funds into the cities of America this year."

"Those who are recommending massive increases now in Federal spending in the cities are, in my view, not being realistic," he said. "They are raising new false hopes that in the past have been dashed repeatedly on the concrete of reality."

TO GIVE PROGRAMS

"Today, the reality is that the budget must be cut; it must be cut in the neighborhood of \$8,000,000,000 and it must be cut by the President of the United States."

Nixon's aides said that despite the candidate's firm belief that immediate massive Federal spending on urban reform is impossible, he will outline new programs of aid to the cities within the next two weeks.

These proposals will add to such programs as a computerized "job bank" to bring jobs and the jobless together and tax incentives to private industry willing to help the ghetto dweller that Nixon has already proposed, aides said.

WILL COST LESS

They will, however, cost far less than the \$2,000,000,000 a month—equal to the current cost of the Vietnam war—recommended by a White House conference on civil rights two years ago, they cautioned.

Some political analysts have begun questioning whether Nixon's repeated assertions that immediate help to resolve the urban crisis is impossible because of the financial crisis means he has decided to abandon hope of getting the Negro vote.

In contrast, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York, who is talking like a candidate for the Republican nomination, has suggested a \$150,000,000,000 public-private crash program for the ghettos over the next decade and the Democratic candidates have also unveiled massive programs.

Nixon's statements appear tailored to the slightly right-of-center position that he usually takes, with an appeal to middle-class voters concerned that increased spending on the cities may be regarded as rewarding the rioters.

But when combined with emphasis on fiscal sanity, a resolve to make no promises to ghetto dwellers that cannot be kept and assurances of heavy public and private spending in the future, it appears short of an appeal to overt racial overtones.

Except in Oregon where he will take part in the May 28 primary in which the names of Rockefeller and Gov. Ronald Reagan, of California, have also been entered, Nixon will make few public appearances during the low-key tour.

He is confining himself to televised press conferences, private meetings with Republican stalwarts and attempts to sell all GOP governors. Little effort is being made to turn out large crowds to see him.

He has said he wishes to see if the governors have any solutions for state problems that can be transferred to the national level, saying the state governments have been overlooked when such solutions are sought.

Meetings were held with Governors Spiro T. Agnew, of Maryland; Warren Knowles, of Wisconsin; James Rhodes, of Ohio; John Volpe, of Massachusetts and Claude Kirk, of Florida, before starting this swing.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 22, 1967]
NIXON CALLS FOR \$8 BILLION SPENDING CUT—
CONSIDERS TAX HIKE AS SECONDARY

CHEYENNE, WYO., April 21.—Richard M. Nixon took a day off from campaigning with a stop in Cheyenne today, but not before calling for an 8 billion dollar federal spending cut and a tax hike.

Nixon stepped off a jet at Cheyenne's airport wearing a blue suit and a wide smile for the 200 women and teen-agers who pressed against a restraining fence.

He will fly to Helena, Mont., tomorrow to resume his campaign for the 1968 Republican Presidential nomination.

MEETING IS DELAYED

Wyoming's Republican Governor Stan Hathaway was unable to meet with Nixon until an early-evening dinner at the red-brick governor's mansion because of prior commitments in the northern part of the state.

The former vice president, on his first Wyoming visit since the 1960 campaign, said he agreed with a warning by William McChesney Martin Jr. of the federal reserve board that the nation's financial crisis was the worst since the depression.

"I agree with Martin about the plight of the nation, but there is only one way we can meet it," Nixon said. "It is imperative the federal budget be cut by \$8 billion."

SPENDING CUT FIRST

He said a tax hike should take a back seat in priority to a spending cut, which Republicans have said is a must before President Johnson's 10 per cent surtax is passed.

Nixon said administration efforts to cut travel abroad and solve the international monetary crisis with "paper gold" were stop-gap measures and came too late to do much good.

Nixon then slipped on a topcoat against the chilly Wyoming wind and stepped briskly to the airport's wire fence to shake hands with supporters carrying placards reading: "Nixon's the One."

QUESTION ON CHURCH

When a man asked if he had been to church, Nixon replied, "I've been way up high," and pointed to the cloudy skies.

Nixon dispelled talk he was seeking to line up delegate votes at the G.O.P. national convention at Miami this summer. He said his talks with Hathaway, who has indicated

his support, but is not formally committed to any candidate, "is an issue discussion, and not a delegate discussion."

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 22, 1968]
CHALLENGES JOHNSON ON BUDGET—NIXON
URGES \$8 BILLION CUTS
(By Ward Just)

CHEYENNE, WYO., April 21.—Richard M. Nixon challenged President Johnson today to "grasp the nettle" and cut the national budget by \$8 billion. He described the Nation as "hurtling down a path toward the worst economical crisis of the postwar era."

The former Vice President, in a statement issued here this afternoon, said that the "Alphonse and Gaston Act" that has gone on between the President and Congress must end. He said the President, without future ambition, was in an "enviable political position" to designate precisely where his budget should be cut.

If the President refuses to act, Nixon said, "then history will not exonerate his application of leadership by blaming Congress . . . history will indict Lyndon Johnson for failing to do what he was elected to do."

Nixon who flew here today to confer with Republican Gov. Stan Hathaway painted a bleak picture of the Nation's economy, which he said was in crisis because of "fiscal mismanagement by the Government of the United States."

If the savings and income of "tens of millions" of Americans are to be safeguarded, he said, "if the international monetary system is to remain intact, if the American dollar is to survive its crisis of confidence abroad, then the United States must act now."

Federal action, he went on, "cannot be the half-hearted, half-measures we have seen in the past. It is far too late in the day to correct our massive payments in balance by taxing American tourists or restricting American investment abroad. It is too late for book-keeping measures . . . our fiscal house must be put in order now."

Nixon aides said that the statement today implicitly "rules out" any proposals by the Republican candidate for massive infusions of Federal funds into the cities to help what has been called the urban crisis.

The aides disclosed that Nixon would make two statements within the next fortnight outlining inexpensive programs to help the cities. Aides have indicated that Nixon felt the economic crisis was so serious that the Nation could not afford large-scale programs.

In the statement issued today, Nixon charged that "those who are recommending massive increases now in Federal spending in the cities are . . . not being realistic. They are raising anew the same false hopes that in the past have been dashed repeatedly on the concrete of reality."

Nixon placed responsibility for budget cuts squarely at the door of the President:

"He alone has access to the mountains of information and the volumes of data with which to set priority programs and limits on spending. No Congressman, no Senator and no Congressional committee has the information or knowledge that is at the fingertips of the President of the United States."

At a press conference in Minneapolis yesterday, he said that presidential candidates who were offering massive Federal programs to aid the poor were being "dishonest" and practicing a "cruel delusion" on the intended recipients of aid.

He implied that the candidates who offered the programs—he named Democratic candidates Robert F. Kennedy and Eugene J. McCarthy—were trying to buy the allegiance of Negroes. Nixon argued that the economy could not support the proposals.

Since the President announced his withdrawal from the campaign, and preliminary peace contacts between Washington and Hanoi have begun, Nixon has eased his at-

tacks on Mr. Johnson. He has been observing a self-imposed "moratorium" of criticisms on the Administration's conduct of the war.

But lately the former Vice President has stepped up his attacks on Democratic rivals, and now appears to be focusing on the Administration's role in the economy as a key campaign issue.

In the document released today, Nixon referred to "budgetary gimmicks and rhetorical exercises . . . for the past five years this Administration has run an uninterrupted stream of budget deficits that have accumulated to a sum in the neighborhood of \$55 billion . . ."

He described the President's withdrawal as a "selfless act" and said "that is why he is the man who can exercise leadership in designating precisely where the budget should be cut." In a political year, he went on, it was unrealistic to expect action by Congress.

If the President will take the lead, the Nixon statement said, "then Congress and the country will follow."

NIXON URGES JOHNSON TO CUT BUDGET BY \$8 BILLION—PLANS TWO MAJOR STATEMENTS TO EXPLAIN HIS PROGRAM OF AID TO THE POOR

(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

CHEYENNE, WYO., April 21.—Richard M. Nixon today challenged President Johnson to cut the budget by \$8-billion and said that history would judge the President harshly if he failed to do so.

The former Vice President, who flew here this morning to confer with Gov. Stanley K. Hathaway, also declared—for the third time in three days—that the "economic crisis" now afflicting the country "rule out any vast new outpouring of Federal funds into the cities this year."

Mr. Nixon said that "those who are recommending massive increases now in Federal spending in the cities are, in my view, not being realistic."

"They are raising anew the same false hopes that in the past have been dashed repeatedly on the concrete of reality," he said. "Today, the reality is that the budget must be cut; it must be cut in the neighborhood of \$8-billion, and it must be cut by the President of the United States."

VIEWS OF OTHER CANDIDATES

Mr. Nixon's estimate of the chances for greater spending in the cities this year has been considerably more severe than the estimate of any other major Presidential candidate in the political arena.

Senator Eugene J. McCarthy of Minnesota, and Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York, both announced Democratic candidates, and Governor Rockefeller of New York, who has said he would accept a Republican draft, have all promised elaborate programs to rebuild the cities.

But Mr. Nixon's statement today—coming on top of his remarks to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on Friday and his remarks at a news conference in Minneapolis yesterday—indicate beyond doubt that he will not engage in competitive bidding with his rivals in order, as he put it in Minneapolis yesterday, "to buy the allegiance of the Negro."

Mr. Nixon's bleak prognosis of spending prospects in the cities was softened somewhat by the news that he would offer, within the next two weeks, two major statements on urban problems that will contain, according to his aides, "two specific programs" for alleviating the plight of the poor.

In his campaign, Mr. Nixon has repeatedly expressed his sympathy for the economic and political objectives of the Negro poor. He has called for "tax and credit programs" that would "enlist" private enterprise in the drive on unemployment and for housing.

But he has never described these programs in any detail. Many observers have believed

that he would soon be obliged to say specifically what he does want to do because he has said so often and so emphatically what he does not want to do—spend vast new sums of Federal money in the cities.

QUESTIONS AMONG STAFF

To do otherwise, these observers believe, would risk the permanent enmity of the Negroes themselves and invite criticism from his rivals.

There has been considerable discussion within his staff, accordingly, about the timing of specific proposals. Some have argued that he should withhold specific programs until later in the campaign when they might have greater impact on the electorate.

Others, however, have insisted that for Mr. Nixon to rule any extensive Federal spending without offering specific non-Federal alternatives would leave him in a politically vulnerable position.

The news that Mr. Nixon will shortly offer detailed programs indicates that the second group has prevailed.

An aide indicated that Mr. Nixon's programs would "cost money" but not "\$2-billion a week," a figure that is commensurate with the costs of the Vietnam war and that has been urged by some civil rights leaders.

In his statement this afternoon, the former Vice President, now considered the front-runner for the Republican Presidential nomination, described the nation as "hurtling down a path toward the worst economic crisis of the post-war era."

Mr. Nixon noted that the international monetary system was under severe strain and that prices had steadily increased. He attributed the crisis to "fiscal mismanagement by the Government of the United States" and "an uninterrupted string of budget deficits that have accumulated to a sum in the neighborhood of \$50-billion."

The candidate insisted that only the President had both the information and authority to put "our fiscal house in order."

He added: "The Alphonse and Gaston act that has gone on with regard to this budget between the White House and Capitol Hill must end now, and the President must end it."

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 22, 1968]

FINANCIAL CRISIS

Both William McChesney Martin Jr. and Richard Nixon have come forward in recent days with grim comments on the state of our nation's financial affairs. There are those who say that the bleakness of the picture is being overdrawn. Maybe so, but we doubt it. And it surely is the part of prudence to listen with close attention to the warnings, not to scoff at them.

As chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Martin cannot possibly be suspected of political or ulterior motives. This country, he told the American Society of Newspaper Editors last week, is plagued by "an intolerable balance of payments deficit side by side with an intolerable domestic deficit. Both have to be corrected, and both have to be corrected over the next several years, or the United States is going to face either an uncontrollable recession or an uncontrollable inflation."

As a presidential candidate, Nixon, we suppose, can be accused of playing politics. But the things he is saying are not what one would expect from an unscrupulous politician.

This nation, he has said, is "hurtling" down a path toward the worst economic crisis of the postwar era." As an immediate remedy he is calling for an \$8 billion cut in Federal spending and a prompt tax increase—the same general remedial steps urged by Martin. Furthermore, Nixon has stated that he

would rather lose the presidential election than promise immediate and massive aid programs to the poor of this country. The economy, he insists, cannot support the massive aid programs that have been proposed, and "I for one am simply not going to join the parade of candidates who come before the American people with promises of billions in spending now when it just isn't in the cards."

Comments such as these add up to an unpopular version of the state of the union. But we think it is a responsible version. Furthermore, it should never be forgotten that it will be the little people—the poor and those living on savings and pensions—who will suffer most cruelly if the warnings go unheeded and if the dire prophecies are fulfilled.

WILL THIS BE THE LONG ROAD TO PEACE OR TO DISILLUSIONMENT?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on March 31, 1968, when President Johnson announced dramatically that he had ordered the partial cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam the hope for peace which springs eternal in the human heart was given added strength.

In the 3 weeks which have elapsed since then, however, that hope has begun to ebb as the jockeying for propaganda advantage between the United States and North Vietnam continues. Those unseemly maneuverings bring into question the bona fides of both sides, since men continue to die in the battles raging in South Vietnam and in the air strikes over North Vietnam south of the 20th parallel.

In the light of the reports of ever-increasing infiltration of South Vietnam by North Vietnam regular troops, one begins to wonder whether President Johnson's half-a-loaf bombing pause was in fact the correct step along the road to peace. There are many who believe that we would be further along the road to peace—if, in fact, we have made any progress at all along that tortuous road since March 31—if President Johnson had at that time announced the permanent and unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam and had coupled that announcement with a call for an immediate, in-place, ceasefire in South Vietnam.

Such action on the part of the United States would have clearly raised the peace issue for all the world to see. It would have forced reciprocal action on the part of the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong who could not find themselves in the absolutely untenable position of being the only ones to continue to kill Vietnamese men, women, and children.

A penetrating, perceptive and accurate analysis of the events of the last 3 weeks since President Johnson's announcement is contained in the lead editorial entitled "Peace: That Elusive Promise," published in the Anchorage Daily News for April 19, 1968.

The editorial states:

The unhappy record of blunder piled on blunder has characterized what the administration piously describes as the Search for Peace in the past 3 years. Promising initiatives have been aborted through inept coordination, through paranoid obsession with secrecy, through Hanoi obduracy and Amer-

ican obduracy, through, on occasion, rank incompetence.

The editorial correctly points out that since the President's announcement of the limitation on the area of the North Vietnam subject to bombing, the bomb load statistics have been as high as, or higher than before.

The editorial concludes:

Wherever the truth may be found, the fact remains that President Johnson lofted what was widely regarded as a tangible peace initiative 20 days ago. And in what history must record as a tortured irony, the allied military set out, simultaneously on a massive sweep entitled "Operation Complete Victory."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE: THAT ELUSIVE PROMISE

Twenty days ago President Lyndon Johnson announced that he was taking unilateral action to deescalate the war in Vietnam by sharply reducing the target areas for American bombers in the North.

He accompanied the announcement of that decision with an earnest plea to the North Vietnamese to join representatives of the United States at a peace table somewhere—anywhere—to bring the whole bloody mess to an end.

And lest his motives be misread as election year politics, he dramatically announced he was scratching his name from consideration for renomination and re-election. The nation and the world reacted with relief at the prospect of peace, acclaim for the President's selfless act.

Now, twenty days later, the adversaries are bogged down in a childish controversy over a meeting site for the preliminary negotiations. Even in the arcane world of diplomacy it is difficult to believe that the physical location of the meeting can be of more than passing importance. Both Hanoi and Washington are behaving like a pair of five-year-olds and meantime soldiers continue to die, civilians continue to die, and the hemorrhage goes on in a country that has spent twenty years on the rack of war.

Consider:

President Johnson has said—and he has reiterated—that he is a man of peace, that our sole objective in South Vietnam is a stable, viable, freely-chosen government in South Vietnam; that he is prepared to go anywhere at any time to discuss with the masters of Hanoi the terms of peace.

How, in the name of reason, can we square such unequivocal words with the interminable schoolboy debate over a meeting site?

And Consider:

The unhappy record of blunder piled on blunder has characterized what the administration piously describes as the Search for Peace in the past three years. Promising initiatives have been aborted through inept co-ordination, through paranoid obsession with secrecy, through Hanoi obduracy and American obduracy, through, on occasion, rank incompetence.

And finally, consider:

Since we pulled back our bombers from Hanoi and Haiphong, limiting them to penetration only to the 20th parallel, the bomb load statistics have been as high as, or higher than, the loads we were dropping before the President's announcement on March 31. What this particular act of de-escalation has meant, then, is that comparable bomb loads have been concentrated on a smaller piece of real estate.

Meantime, Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford says there is no sign that North Vietnam has responded with measurable de-

escalation to the bombing limitation. (Reports from correspondents in the field, however, contradict Clifford's appraisal. They agree there is solid evidence that the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese effort has slackened, perhaps as a preliminary to disengagement.)

Wherever the truth may be found, the fact remains that President Johnson lofted what was widely regarded as a tangible peace initiative twenty days ago. And in what history must record as a tortured irony, the allied military set out, simultaneously on a massive sweep entitled "Operation Complete Victory."

THE LESSONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Bill D. Moyers, formerly special assistant to the President and now the publisher of Newsday, Inc., has written a perceptive and thought-provoking article entitled "The Lessons and Implications of Vietnam." It is a succinct article, and I commend it to the attention of Senators and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and may not have access to Newsday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LESSONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF VIETNAM (By Bill D. Moyers, former special assistant to the President)

Even if human reason and mutual concessions fail, the law of averages will eventually settle the war in Vietnam. There never has been a war that did not end in one way or the other, in one generation or another. At this moment, despite the noises between Hanoi and Washington, that is about the only certainty on which to pin one's optimism. Mankind survives man's worst mistakes.

But what will we have learned?

We will have learned—or re-learned, I should say—an old truism: the law of national sovereignty requires that people be able to organize their search for liberty, identity, and happiness—not to mention the right to err—in ways that are relevant to their own experience and value. For all our good intentions and Puritan sense of mission, we cannot change that law. As the Soviet Union is learning in Eastern Europe, and as we will inevitably learn in Southeast Asia, a nation cannot use its military power to establish or even to preserve institutions in other countries which are incompatible to the nature of the people over whom the contest is being waged. It is altogether possible, as D. W. Brogan has suggested, that "there will be no South Vietnamese state committed emotionally, ideologically, by gratitude, by necessity, to follow the policies of the U.S. in Asia, and still less in the world."

EMERGENCE OF PLURAL WORLD

We will also have learned that a truly plural world has emerged beyond any single bloc's control. We are caught at the present between the last vestiges of a cold war between two great power blocs and the emergence of independent and interdependent nation states. The revival of nationalism in every part of the globe, while relieving the cold war between the two great blocs, has already brought about conditions which no single large power can dominate and no international organization is yet strong enough to control. Given the nature of the instabilities in the technologically undeveloped world, neither the Soviets nor the Americans nor the United Nations can prevent those instabilities from creating one crisis after another.

Therefore? Therefore, we must avoid giving every specific conflict an ultimate value. Why should these conflicts become Armageddon unless national survival is truly at stake? In practical terms, this means that no great power should enter these conflicts in such a way as to leave another great power with the single alternative of surrender. Peace in this turbulent period depends upon the ability of the large powers to agree, not upon a clash of stubborn wills, the only resolution of which is an ultimate test of arms.

Lesson No. 3 follows from the fact: there are some wars which can be neither won nor lost—only disposed of. Twenty years of the "balance of terror" should have convinced both the U.S. and the Soviet Union that nuclear power is at best—and at worst—apocalyptic power. Its possession assures us only of the means to annihilate one another.

Simultaneously, the decline of military ideology and the rise of nationalism in independent states restrict the efficacy of power in local conflicts. We intervened in Vietnam for a paradoxical purpose—to prevent a military victory, not to win one. For it is apparent to reasonable men not inebriated by the infallibility of their own ideology that the situation in Southeast Asia defies a military solution. For one thing, we are dealing with people who do not wish to be defended at an excessively high cost; and for another, the conditions that created this conflict will persist beyond any military resolution short of the total defeat of one or more of the parties. Of that kind of resolution we would be able to say, with Tacitus: "It was rather a cessation of war than a beginning of peace."

There is yet another lesson which is becoming apparent because of Vietnam: the primary threat to world peace has shifted from Europe to Asia. Ironically, however, Vietnam has distorted the significance of this shift.

Since 1945 the principal threat to western security has been the Soviet Union. It remains a danger. But as the countries of Eastern Europe have moved from the status of satellites to allies with separate ambitions, as the countries of Western Europe have prospered, as the Soviet Union has turned more and more to the internal needs of its people, the immediate danger in Europe has diminished. It has shifted to Asia, and principally to the enigma that is China. Unfortunately our preoccupation with Vietnam has not enabled us to think clearly and objectively about China. On the contrary, the important issues have been more darkly obscured by the fog of rhetoric rising from the camps of the hawks and the doves over the emotionally-charged issue of Asia communism.

This is a time for question-asking. Will China prove as militarily belligerent as she is verbally belligerent? Would she be able, if she sought to do so, to mobilize unified support in the Communist world for expansionist policies? What are the prospects that, as in the Soviet Union, militant ideological creeds will bend to the issues of problem-solving and social change? Has a century of abrasive exploitation by western powers, mixed with the dogmatism of her present leaders, rendered her hopelessly paranoid toward the West? What is the correct military posture toward China so that we are strong enough to avert the worst and wise enough to recognize opportunities of accommodation if they appear? Are we wise enough to direct our concern not against the Chinese people or even against internal Chinese communism, but against any real—and real should be stressed—acts of aggression?

DIFFUSE POWER CENTERS

In the meantime, Vietnam has demonstrated how urgently we must encourage diffuse centers of power throughout Asia so

that the people of that region can reconcile their differences among themselves. Painful as it is for us to admit, their needs cannot be met ultimately by decisions in Washington or Moscow. They must be met by decisions in their own capitals. Since World War II we have filled the power vacuums in South Korea, Taiwan, Japan, and Indochina; in light of what we have learned, the burden of our rhetoric must become the brunt of our policy: an insistence that these and other Asian countries, including North Vietnam, determine the future character of Asia by their own political devices.

This does not mean that we should be so frustrated by the agonies of the war in Vietnam that we think simply to "pull back" will strengthen the peace in Asia. It does mean that of the lessons we have learned, the greatest is the lesson of humility. No matter how vast our power, we cannot create order and peace, much less justice and dignity, in Asia. These depend only in a limited sense upon the military deterrence of those who still advocate force; in the larger, most lasting, sense they can be won only by the political imagination of the people whose own way of life is at stake.

OFFICIAL METHODIST RESOLUTION DECLARES FOR PEACE STEPS IN VIETNAM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the general board of Christian social concerns of the Methodist Church, on February 29, 1968, adopted a statement on the war in Vietnam which was very critical of the American policy. This action was taken at their annual meeting held in San Antonio, Tex.

It should be noted that after President Johnson's announcement of the cessation of bombing over most of North Vietnam, Dr. Dudley Ward, general secretary of the Methodist board, made arrangements to go to Prague, Czechoslovakia, to persuade church leaders gathered there from Communist countries that this action by the United States was a genuine effort to get negotiations started and that there should be a prompt and affirmative response by the North Vietnamese Government. Dr. Ward canceled the trip to Prague after learning of the continued U.S. bombing of targets more than 200 miles inside North Vietnam, feeling that the continued bombing destroyed his case with the churchmen from Communist countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution on Vietnam adopted by the general board of Christian social concerns of the Methodist Church may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

Resolution adopted by the annual meeting of the general board of Christian social concerns, the Methodist Church, February 29, 1968, in San Antonio, Tex.

A. THE SITUATION WHICH MAKES THIS STATEMENT TIMELY AND ADVISABLE

The persistence of the war in Vietnam, its threat to social improvement within the United States, and the danger of its leading to a general conflagration, require our profound concern. The moral issues involved are of great significance and cannot be avoided. The Christian church, in wrestling with this problem, should be more than a reflection of national sentiments and perspectives; it

should test them against our best insights into love, justice, and reconciliation.

B. THE BIBLICAL-THEOLOGICAL-ETHICAL BASIS OF THIS STATEMENT

As believers that all men are children of God and that, if God's spirit acts through us, we can be reconcilers of men, we must seek better ways of dealing with disputes among men. The fruits of the spirit that make for peace are poorly nourished by a war that degrades and divides. As "good Samaritans" we must help to relieve men of the greatest robber and killer—war, bind up their wounds, and set them on a new and better way.

C. TEXT OF THE STATEMENT

The members of the Board of Christian Social Concerns of The Methodist Church are loyal citizens of the United States, devoted to the principles of freedom, justice, and brotherhood upon which this nation was founded. The members of the Board are also Christians whose first allegiance is to God, under whose judgment the policies and actions of all nations must pass.

For some years this Board has expressed publicly its growing concern and alarm over the course and consequences of United States policy in Southeast Asia. A large portion of the time, energy and resources of the Board has been devoted to the study and analysis of the Vietnam conflict and to strenuous efforts to direct the attention of the American people and public officials to the issues involved and to alternative courses of action.

We believe the time has now arrived to speak even more forcefully. The rising toll of casualties, military and civilian, and the continued diversion of resources from the heightened crisis in our cities at home leave us no alternative.

The war in Vietnam is clearly a stalemate. Further escalation will only prolong the stalemate at a higher level of destruction. If the escalation involves the bombing of foreign ships in Haiphong Harbor, or the invasion of North Vietnam, or the use of nuclear weapons, it may lead to the nuclear holocaust which all sane men dread.

The administration must end its unjustified expressions of optimism which have caused the credibility gap and undermined public confidence in the nation's leaders. Those in government who are determined that their theories of counter-insurgency should succeed in Vietnam no matter what the cost in life or treasure must come to their senses and halt the tragic experiment. Those officials whose investment of personal effort and prestige in behalf of present policies has been buttressed by stubborn pride must yield to the grim lessons of history.

Sooner or later a ceasefire and negotiations will conclude the Vietnam conflict. The sooner this can begin, the fewer American and Vietnamese lives will be lost. The greater the power of a belligerent, the greater its ability to take the risks involved in initiating negotiations leading to a settlement.

If the world is to avoid such immoral, brutal and wasteful wars in the future, mankind must diligently study the lessons on Vietnam. They include these:

1. National power, even of the United States, has its limitations and cannot solve all of the problems of the developing nations nor shape their destinies.
2. Military and political intervention by one nation in the affairs of another raises grave moral issues particularly when it conflicts with principles of self-determination or aids governments lacking public support.
3. Peacekeeping and peacemaking need to become tasks of the United Nations or of a multinational regional organization, which organizations should be strengthened and used.

4. Secure peace with freedom and justice requires continued attention to and significant progress toward safeguarded disarmament, granting to the United Nations—with membership open to all nations—of sufficient authority to enact, interpret and enforce world law, greater use of the International Court of Justice and acceleration of the development of the emerging nations.

5. It is time to re-examine the U.S. posture toward communist nations.

We wholeheartedly commend the Secretary General of the UN for his persistent and courageous leadership in trying to prepare the way for a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam war.

We cannot prescribe all that leaders of government should do, but certain directions are clear.

1. The U.S. should declare that its primary intent in South Vietnam is to negotiate for genuine self-determination for all the people and for the withdrawal of all outside military forces.

2. Every possible effort for de-escalation should be made by all parties to the war. This would mean such things as an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, an end to search-and-destroy tactics, an end to terrorist incursions, and the assumption of a military posture designed to minimize casualties while negotiations are sought.

3. The U.S. should affirm its willingness to negotiate with both North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front and should make clear that the Thieu-Ky government will not be allowed to veto such negotiations because of its own reluctance to participate.

4. The National Liberation Front and the government of North Vietnam should make appropriate responses to de-escalation initiatives by the U.S. and the government of South Vietnam.

5. Every effort should be made to arrange effective guarantees against reprisals following such a negotiated settlement.

6. The U.S. should offer to channel substantial assistance through international agencies to aid in the reconstruction and development of Vietnam.

We do not pretend that such a course of action would provide a good solution in a tragic conflict to which there are no good solutions. However, we are convinced that the continuance and escalation of the struggle in Vietnam constitutes the greatest evil and injustice in the situation. As Christians, we are no longer in doubt that the time has arrived for this nation to face a difficult moment of truth.

To pursue further a military victory in Vietnam would be to compound the evil in which the United States is now enmeshed. We must acknowledge God, must draw upon resources of moral courage, and must act decisively to abate the war and move toward a negotiated withdrawal.

MARVIN WATSON: NEW POSTMASTER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was my pleasure this morning to present Mr. Marvin Watson to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That committee reported favorably, by unanimous vote, the nomination of Mr. Watson to be the new Postmaster General of the United States.

It is traditional for the President to appoint to this post a man who has served him closely and well. Marvin Watson is such a man. Any one of us who has had any dealings with the President has dealt with Marvin Watson. He has been an extremely efficient assistant to the President of the United States for over 3 years.

It is in that capacity that I have gotten to know this man well over the past 3 years, that he has served as appointments Secretary to the President. Although out of the nature of our duties we have had occasional differences of opinion in matters such as patronage, I have always found Marvin Watson to be a man of amazing tact and good will, one who has kept any differences from causing problems. In my position on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I will work closely with the new Postmaster General and I am glad that my fellow Texan, Marvin Watson, will be that man.

I ask unanimous consent that a biography of Marvin Watson be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF W. MARVIN WATSON,
POSTMASTER GENERAL DESIGNEE**

W. Marvin Watson was named to be Postmaster General of the United States by President Lyndon B. Johnson on April 10, 1968.

During the announcement concerning the nomination of Mr. Watson, whom the President refers to as the "most efficient man I have ever known," the President said Mr. Watson "has served me ably for a good deal of the time I have been President."

Mr. Watson, Special Assistant to the President since February 1, 1965, will succeed Lawrence F. O'Brien, who submitted his resignation April 10.

William Marvin Watson was born in Oakhurst, Texas on June 6, 1924. He attended high school in Huntsville, Texas, and upon graduation, entered Baylor University. He served in the United States Marine Corps during World War II. Mr. Watson was graduated from Baylor in 1949, receiving a Bachelor of Business Administration degree. He continued his education at the same university and was awarded an M.A. degree in Economics in 1950.

Mr. Watson's professional career includes positions in the educational, public and private sectors. He was an instructor in the Economics Department at Baylor University. From 1951-1954, he held positions as Chamber of Commerce Manager, City Secretary and City Judge, in Daingerfield, Texas. During 1955, he served with the Red River Valley Association in Shreveport, Louisiana.

In 1956, Mr. Watson was named as executive assistant to the President of Lone Star Steel Company. He held this position until January 31, 1965.

From 1951 until January 31, 1965, Mr. Watson was active in water conservation programs in the State of Texas and specifically in Northeast Texas. During this time, he served as a State Vice President of the Red River Valley Association; Secretary, then President, of the Northeast Texas Municipal Water District. He was appointed to the Governor's Statewide Water Recreation Study Committee and was made chairman of that Committee which submitted to the Governor a comprehensive report on the future of water recreation in the State of Texas.

Mr. Watson has long had an interest in government and has actively participated in the civic and economic development of his native state. This interest, first generated in the courthouse square in Huntsville, Texas, was later manifested in activities at the state and national levels. Mr. Watson was a member of the Texas Civil Judicial Council; President of the Alumni Association of the Hankamer School of Business, Baylor University; Member of the Executive Board of the Texas Law Enforcement Foundation, Member of the Texas Industrial Development

Council, the Texas Water Development Council, the State Board of Directors of the Texas United Fund; and served on Governmental Affairs Committee for both the East Chamber of Commerce and the West Texas Chamber of Commerce. In 1964, he was nominated by Governor Connally and elected to the post of Chairman of the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee. In the summer of 1964, he participated in the Democratic National Convention in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

On February 1, 1965, Mr. Watson was appointed by President Johnson as Special Assistant to the President. He has served at that post until the present time.

Mr. Watson married the former Marion Baugh of Waco, Texas. They have three children: Winston Lee Watson, 21, a student at the University of Maryland; a daughter, Kimberly Baugh Watson, 17, a student at Mount Vernon Seminary; and a four year old son, William Marvin Watson, III.

The Watsons are active in the church where Mr. Watson is a Deacon. He has long been active in his church, having taught Bible Classes, served extensively on church committee and participated in all lay activities.

WE MUST SAVE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' RIGHT TO WORK

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I had hoped in the closing weeks of the first session of the 89th Congress and again in January 1966, that the issue of compulsory unionism had been laid to rest.

Unfortunately, it is now becoming obvious that this was not necessarily so.

It has come to my attention that the Johnson administration's Labor Management Review Commission is preparing recommendations for changes in President Kennedy's Executive Order No. 10988, which governs labor-management relations in the Federal Government, and the suggestions very likely will include some form of compulsory union membership.

Mr. President, be it by efforts to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, or by Executive order, or any other shape or form, compulsory unionism is morally wrong and a major threat to the freedom of all Americans.

I understand that the Commission's report is expected within a month, and if the President accepts it and signs it the report would become Federal policy at once.

Unfortunately, I find this another classic example of the Federal Government seeking to destroy the rights and initiative of the individual—this time the Federal employee.

The Federal civilian employee should be no different than any other employee when it comes to his basic, fundamental right to choose whether or not he should join a union.

I find it particularly unfortunate that in choosing the Executive order route for this encroachment the administration is bypassing Congress and the American people.

The Commission, headed by Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, and the Johnson administration apparently have failed to learn the lessons of the 1966 election when scores of Congressmen who voted to repeal section 14(b) were defeated at the polls partially because they voted to destroy a basic American freedom.

My State of Utah has a right-to-work law, and I have received many letters from civil servants in the State strongly urging me to do all I can to oppose this back-door attempt at compulsory unionism which would deny them the right that a private employee has in my State.

Federal civil service workers are the largest single bloc of employees in Utah, and they are deeply concerned.

Mr. President, I have today written to the President of the United States as well as Secretary of Labor Wirtz strongly objecting to any modifications of Executive Order No. 10988 and informing them that should this be done I shall introduce legislation to correct it. I cannot sit idly by and watch the freedom and the right to work of these fine people wiped out merely by the stroke of the Presidential pen.

I deeply believe in the right of any American to join a labor organization, but I also believe with equal force the right of any American not to join a labor organization.

I and the majority of the people of Utah believe that no man in this country should be required to pay union dues to a political-labor organization with which he might not agree. I feel that forced membership in any organization is a violation of the sacred personal rights which make this country great.

Mr. President, I think that under these circumstances the Senate should be reminded of what President Kennedy said when he issued Executive Order No. 10988 in 1962 and for that purpose I quote his words here:

Employees of the Federal government shall have and shall be protected in the exercise of the right, free and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join and assist any employee organization, or to refrain from such activities.

Former Secretary of Labor Goldberg in speaking before the American Federation of Government Employees said:

I know you will agree with me that the union shop and the closed shop are inappropriate to the Federal government. . . . In your own organization you have to win acceptance by your own conduct, your own action, your own wisdom, your own responsibility and your own achievement.

Nothing has happened since, Mr. President, that should justify reversing these statements.

Speaking of compulsory unionism may I say again what I said in the Senate in October 1965, good unions do not need it and bad unions do not deserve it.

THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE WORKERS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on May 5, the International Association of Machinists & Aerospace Workers will celebrate its 80th anniversary. I wish to extend my best wishes to IAM members on this occasion.

Tom Talbot, the founder and first president of the association, represented the spirit of the labor movement when he wrote in 1889:

This Association is composed strictly of practical men who have a higher ambition in life than to merely earn a living, but who wish to rear up families that will make good and useful citizens and who have a desire to see their shopmates lifted from a life of continuous trouble and anxiety and placed in a position where they will have equal facilities to demand their rights and privileges and who also have sufficient judgment to equally respect the rights and privileges of others.

It is a tribute to the leadership of this association that, inspired by the words and example of Tom Talbot, it has grown into one of the dynamic and vital forces in the Nation today.

All association members, from the rank and file to IAM President Roy Siemiller, deserve commendation and congratulations on 80 years of achievement.

I wish them many more anniversaries and continued success.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 80th" published in the Machinist of Thursday, April 25, 1968.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 80TH

Old Tom Talbot, the founder and first president of this Association, would be pleased and proud if he could see us today.

It was 80 years ago, come May 5th, that Talbot and those 18 other machinists dropped into that locomotive pit at the Atlanta, Ga., railroad yards. They decided to form a union of machinists, and each of them put up \$1.25 to defray the expenses.

The National Association of Machinists, NAM, as they called it, had several predecessors. Earlier efforts to organize machinists had failed for many reasons. Sometimes they struck too soon or put too much reliance on politics, or a depression and unemployment disrupted their efforts.

Talbot's experience had come from the old Knights of Labor. He had been a state organizer for the Knights. The year 1888 was a bad year for machinists. Wages were declining. They were lucky to get 20 cents an hour, \$2 for a 10-hour day.

A JUST ANGER

Years later, we interviewed Talbot's sister. She was asked why her brother had tried to do what must have seemed the impossible. She claimed he did it out of anger, that he was angry at a world in which a skilled machinist couldn't afford to send his son to high school. Such was the condition of the trade when this union was founded.

That the IAM has survived at all is a miracle. That it thrived and grew into a great useful institution serving members in every province, in Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, and Wake, Guam and Midway Islands is ample testimony to the freedom that working people enjoy in the United States and Canada.

The success of the IAM is also testimony to the fact that machinists, and aerospace workers and those in the allied trades, are not bemused by age. We have kept up with the times; we are keeping pace with progress.

We faced the challenge of industrial organization and, in countless cases, adopted it. We have faced the fact that men are entitled to be judged and to be paid according to their abilities and not discriminated against because of race or color or national origin. Every member of the IAM goes first class.

We have profited from the experience, the mistakes and the successes of those who have gone before.

LOOKING AHEAD

This year when we have just recently signed the millionth member, we can face the future confident of our strength, proud of our leadership and, as machinists always have been, never contented.

On this eightieth birthday, let us remind ourselves that with all our years, we still need 15 cents to buy a cup of coffee.

NEED TO SAVE BIG THICKET OF TEXAS IS URGENT—SID MOODY OF ASSOCIATED PRESS DEFINES NEED FOR WILDERNESS AREAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 11, 1967, I introduced S. 4, a bill to establish the Big Thicket National Park in Texas. Time is running out on us; each day that passes without action on S. 4, more and more of the Big Thicket is being destroyed. I urge action on the bill at this session of Congress so that we may begin now to save a portion of this natural beauty of Texas.

The need for the passage of the bill is urgent. Already, the encroachment of civilization has reduced the Big Thicket, once a great forest, to about one-tenth its original size. Only an act of Congress can now save it from total destruction.

The Big Thicket is one of the most rare and unique areas in our country. The distinctive combination of climates has produced unique species of plant and animal life, and this alone is one reason why a portion of the Big Thicket should be preserved.

But more than that is the need for man to have a place of refuge. Secretary Udall has said, "Man is a part of nature. He needs Great Swamps and Yellowstones and Alaskas. They are the tie to the earth. The more we build a pressure cooker society, the more we need the wilderness as an escape valve."

In the Houston Post of Sunday, April 21, 1968, Sid Moody, of the Associated Press, wrote an article entitled "To Save the Wilderness: Our Only One," in which he stated:

Suppose at some future day man finds he has tipped the balance of nature too far. Suppose he finds that he needs the seed, the animal, the unadulterated genetic resources that are the basis of his evolution? And suppose they are gone, or hopelessly distorted?

Then, indeed, may he cry ah, wilderness. It is to prevent the possibility of such a dead end that a growing number of conservationists are looking to the wilderness as a gene "bank." If for some reason, man needs a bighorn sheep or sequoia or the delicate harmony of a forest acre, it will be there, in the wilderness.

Mr. President, as I have stated, the Big Thicket in southeast Texas, near Beaumont, is a rare and unique home for both the usual and unusual forms of plant and animal life. Action is needed now on S. 4 so that this and future generations may enjoy the natural wonders there and perhaps someday find the "ultimate chance for his own survival."

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO SAVE THE WILDERNESS: OUR ONLY ONE

(By Sid Moody)

In the beginning was the land, all there would be, then and forever: mountain and meadow, forest and prairie.

Man came later.

He humbled the land, mile upon mile, town upon town. The wide spaces narrowed and narrow still. And will it end only when the suffering land, all of it, is gone, rutted and shorn by man's plow and ax?

The Dust Bowl of the 1930s; the clawed scars of strip mines in the Kentucky hills of yesterday and right now; scummed rivers lethal to life: man has done it all.

Such rape and its consequences, says Stewart Udall, is America's "quiet crisis."

WHO IS MAN TO KNOW?

Not just because of its sheer waste, but because man, as he changes the land, is tampering with the very house in which he was created. And no one, none, can say if after millennia of such tampering man still not stand homeless in an alien land he has desecrated. An example:

A young boy desirous of a bike saved up money by trapping skunks around his family's upstate New York farm. The bike finally bought, he pedaled to the pond where he used to enjoy watching wild ducks raising their young. They were gone. Why? The skunks he trapped fed on turtle eggs. No skunks, more turtles—who ate the ducks.

That has the simplicity of a bedtime story. Consider, then, this potential nightmare. In Brazil there is talk of making a reservoir in the Amazon basin as large as Western Europe. "Has any one asked what withdrawing this much oxygen-producing green might mean to mankind?" asks David Brewer, outspoken executive secretary of the Sierra Club, a U.S. conservationist group.

Can man, who dams rivers, levels forests and paves swamps, be so arrogant as to be sure he is no more than that little boy traveling a path whose end he knows not?

WHAT IS A WILDERNESS?

We have heard these voices before: Keep America's air fresh, her streams pure, her cities clean. Now there are those that warn: save the wilderness while some remains.

They argue for reasons of aesthetics, for traditional reasons of conservation. And for a newer one: that the virgin wilderness may some day be man's ultimate chance for his own survival.

"It is not given man to make a wilderness," said Brewer, quoting from author Wallace Stegner. "But he can make a desert. And has."

And cut off in such a desert, having blighted the plant and animal whose destiny he shares, man conceivably could wither. Some day.

Some facts:

The land and water area of the 50 states totals 2.3 billion acres.

Of this, about 10 per cent remains as time has made it. The rest: cities, farms, highways, reservoirs, factories.

From this 10 per cent the United States will set aside large areas of wilderness. This was decided by the Wilderness Act of 1934.

But pivotal questions have not been decided: how much wilderness is enough: for aesthetics, for conservation, for, perhaps, survival? And what, to be sure, is a wilderness?

The act defines wilderness as "an area where earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

CAN'T SEE FOREST FOR TREES

But...

Congress, confronted with political realities, will permit mining in wilderness areas of the U.S. Forest Service until 1984.

Mining? In a wilderness?

One man's wilderness is not another's.

"If land is not for man's use—his food, his shelter, his recreation—what good is it?" asks a government conservationist. Few, if any, of the commercial users of the land would disagree. Nor do they argue that some land should not be set aside inviolate. But, again, how much for which use, including the use of simply remaining as it is and was?

"Every day they constantly chip away more of our resources."

That is a timber industry lobbyist talking of land set aside for conservation.

"They are constantly whittling away our resources."

That is a conservationist talking of the commercial users of the land. Clearly, each does not see each other's forest for the trees.

More facts:

The major land holders of the United States are the Bureau of Land Management, 452 million acres, about two-fifths of the nation, the Forest Service, 186.3 million acres, two-fifths of the nation's forests, the Fish and Wildlife Service, 28.5 million acres, and the Park Service, 27.5 million acres. The lands of the latter three agencies will be sites of the proposed wilderness areas.

EVERY LITTLE BIT HELPS

The Forest Service, which allows multiple use of its lands including mining, grazing and logging, has, nonetheless, set aside 15 million acres as wilderness and primitive areas in a program begun in 1924.

By the act, however, these lands will have to be restudied as well as proposals of the other agencies and receive congressional approval.

The Forest Service has studied wilderness areas totaling 1.9 million acres so far and has designated one million to be presented to Congress. The Park Service is studying 57 areas ranging in size from 5,000 acres, the minimum under the act, to 100,000 acres, including such national parks as Isle Royale in Lake Superior and Lassen in California. Fish and Wildlife is considering about 90 refuges ranging from the huge 1.8 million-acre Jenal Moose Range in Alaska to the 1,900-acre Great Swamp refuge in New Jersey.

Last month President Johnson sent Congress the first actual proposals for official designation: 24 areas in 13 states totalling almost one million acres.

Making a capital "W" wilderness out of a wilderness, is, however, a thorny business. The Forest Service has proposed a 142,000 acres San Rafael Wilderness in the Los Padres National Forest in California. The Wilderness Society, a conservationist group that treads more softly but as determinedly as the Sierra Club through the nation's forests, claim the wilderness should include "hundreds of additional acres the Forest Service insists is vital for fire control."

"Why battle for 2,000 acres?" says Michael Nadel, assistant executive director of the society. "Because we must try and save every piece of land we can. How plentiful is the 2½ per cent of the American land we are trying to save when every corner of the country will be developed with the technological improvements we have now or will soon have?"

IT'S FOR ALL AMERICANS

The Park Service, too, has difficulties with its friends and foes, there are those, even in the department, who feel, stridently, that national parks should remain as primitive as possible. Few roads. Few lodges. None of the mob scenes that descend on Yosemite on summer weekends, littering the valley with trailers, beer cans and film wrappers.

Yet national park attendance, 130 millions in 1966, rises about 10 per cent yearly.

What should be the over-all policy of the Park Service which welcomes many thousands to its Washington Monument and tens, if that, to the summit of its Mount McKinley?

It tries to strike a mean of the greatest good for the greatest number without impairing the virginity of the park.

Parks to be are almost as much a headache as parks in being.

The Park Service, for instance, wants to include the Buffalo River in Arkansas in a system of national wild rivers.

"But the people who live along the river love it. They want it, and themselves, to be left alone," said a Park Service planner. So the park ranger in Hot Springs drops up whenever he can to spread good will—and the message: Buffalo River is not just for its residents, it's for all Americans.

MINES, CANALS, RUNWAYS

As competition for the finite land increases so does the necessity for the American genius for compromise. But can a compromised wilderness be a wilderness? Or even a park?

The Glacier Peak Wilderness in Washington has 450,000 acres of virgin land and the Kennecott Copper Co. owns 320 acres of ore-rich land right in the middle. Conservation, or copper?

Canals cut by the Corps of Engineers have cut off natural water flow to the Everglades, endangering its flora and fauna. Wildlife, or waterways?

The Great Swamp in New Jersey, a rare virginial wild only 80 miles from New York City, is the site the Port of New York Authority wants for a mammoth airport. Birds, or jets?

The effort to make Wilderness out of the wilderness creates some fine points, some small, some not.

The dispute between the Forest Service, with its multiple use program for national forests, and the Park Service, with its creed of minimal interference of the land, reached such a pitch in the 1960s that Udall and Freeman had to sign a peace pact that is now known as the "Treaty of the Potomac."

THANKS—FOR NOT BUILDING

Yet warfare broke out again last year in a "Dear Stew-Deer Orv" correspondence over the Forest Service plans for a highway through the giant sequoias. Udall felt a road to the proposed Mineral King ski development posed an air and water pollution hazard to the unique trees.

Freeman replied: "You, and your department... are clearly attempting to block National Forest development in ways that are not justified."

"To what extent can I play God with Orville Freeman," Udall said later. He gave his consent to the road.

But who is the ultimate winner—or loser? The skiers, who can roam the Rockies for snow? Or the giant sequoias, who have but one home in the world?

On the other hand, if Freeman's assurances prove wrong and the sequoias are harmed, so what? Who really needs sequoias or crocodiles or undammed mountain streams in a West always wondering where tomorrow's drinking water will come from?

Who needs wilderness, really?

Surely, said a Forest Service planner, to the average man in the street a drive down the Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia may be as much wilderness as he will ever see. Or ever want to.

"But at the same time there is a deep personal comfort to almost every one knowing that somewhere out there is a rugged land that is hard to get to but is there, unspoiled. Maybe some day he'll go, maybe not, but it's there."

"Man is a part of nature," said Udall. "He needs Great Swamps and Yellowstones and Alaskas. They are his tie to the earth. The more we build a pressure cooker society, the more we need the wilderness as an escape valve."

"Maybe 50 years from now we'll be thanked more for what we didn't build than what we did," said an aide.

"The wilderness is land that can be found in balance scientifically. It is run by the laws of nature, not man," said Nadel.

FOR ONCE AND FOR ALL

Suppose at some future day man finds he has tipped the balance of nature too far. Suppose he finds that he needs the seed, the animal, the unadulterated genetic resources that are the bases of his evolution? And suppose they are gone, or hopelessly distorted?

Then, indeed, may he cry ah, wilderness.

It is to prevent the possibility of such a dead end that a growing number of conservationists are looking to the wilderness as a gene "bank." If, for some reason, man needs a bighorn sheep or a sequoia or the delicate harmony of a forest acre, it will be there, in the wilderness.

The key question, then, as Udall put it, "Is whether we can draw laws in these areas (of conservation) with some certainty, they won't be changed."

"The wilderness can't be won once and for all," said Brower. "It can only be lost once and for all."

THE SEIZURE OF THE "PUEBLO"

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today marks the third month anniversary of the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo*. On January 23 I sent a telegram to the President urging immediate use of force to avenge this act of piracy on the high seas.

I received a brief reply from one of his assistants stating that the President would use diplomatic channels to obtain the release of the ship and her crew. On February 13, I sent a letter to the chairman of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, pointing out that there were several questions surrounding the *Pueblo* seizure that warranted formal investigation. I stated that in my opinion it was well within the responsibilities of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee to look into these questions and make a report. Today I received a petition from my friends and constituents in South Carolina, primarily from the cities of Abbeville and McCormick, urging a more forceful program to avenge the *Pueblo* and effect the release of her crew.

The *Pueblo* legacy has been a great loss in American prestige, a chorus of criticism from the editorial pages of leading newspapers throughout the Far East and criticism and satire from the major capitals of Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. I have spoken out against this outrage many times on the Senate floor, as well as on TV and in many public gatherings across the country. With each opportunity to speak on this subject, I usually conclude with, "How long are we going to wait?"

I thought it particularly fitting on this date, April 23, to send another telegram to the President, 90 days after my first message, urging a more forceful program to obtain the release of the *Pueblo* and her men.

Mr. President, in that regard I invite the attention of Senators to an editorial entitled "Remember the *Pueblo*—How Long Do We Wait?" published in the Spartanburg, S.C., Herald-Journal, of April 23, 1968. The editorial points out that while the crucial time for a prompt retaliation has passed, the time for determination and strength has not passed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the text of

my telegram to the President be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald-Journal, Apr. 21, 1968]

REMEMBER THE "PUEBLO"?—How Long Do We Wait?

An Associated Press picture shows a comely woman holding a placard which says, "Remember the Pueblo."

She is Mrs. Loyd M. Bucher, wife of the ship's captain. She is urging Americans not to "forget our men."

A letter to the editor asks: "Is there really no hope for the men of the USS Pueblo? Is her fate and theirs really finalized by the inaction of our government?"

"Is not just one American boy worth our justified action and wrath?"

"Come on, America, wake up! Have we lost our sense of national pride? Our honor? Have we lost the ability to cry for one of our own? Have we lost our guts?"

Are these the pleas of only two insignificant voices in our land—one the wife of a man held in alien hands, the other a person of crude nationalism?

No. There are many troubled Americans who cannot accept the continuing degradation of leaving a U.S. Navy vessel and her crew captive in North Korea.

One of the nation's most respected military experts, Hanson Baldwin of The New York Times, was asked about the Pueblo in a retirement interview.

"We should have sunk the Pueblo and bombed the docks of Wonsan," he said.

"We should never have allowed a U.S. Navy ship to fall into enemy hands."

The crucial time for prompt and forceful action passed in confusion and inaction, of course. It cannot be recalled or recreated.

But the time for determination and strength is not past.

The United States cannot continue to allow its men to be held as hostages in international extortion without forceful counteraction.

APRIL 23, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

Today marks the third month anniversary of the seizing of the *Pueblo*. During this period the anguish of relatives of the crew of the *Pueblo* has mounted, and American prestige has suffered. I urge a more forceful program to obtain release of the *Pueblo* and her men.

STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senator.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1052, S. 1401.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 1401) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

CXIV—649—Part 8

pore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had further disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. BOW, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. LAIRD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1401) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the pending bill, S. 1401, is in the nature of emergency legislation to save and maintain the outdoor recreation programs of the States and of the Federal Government which are so vital to the well-being of this generation and future generations. The bill would accomplish this purpose by providing for a limited period of 5 years, a new source of desperately needed revenue for the land and water conservation fund, from which the States have been getting a large part of the financing for State programs, and to amend the basic law to give the Secretary of the Interior authority to take speedy action to deal, in some part at least, with the increasingly serious problems growing out of land price escalation.

The new source of revenue provided by S. 1401 is a portion of the Federal share of the receipts from mineral leasing operations on the Outer Continental Shelf—that area seaward of State boundaries over which we asserted the

sovereignty of the Federal Government by the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953 in the 83d Congress.

Under the committee amendment to the bill, an amount from the Outer Continental Shelf receipts would be made available to bring the income of the land and water conservation fund up to a total of \$200 million a year for the fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971. For the remaining 2 years of the 5-year period, that is, fiscal 1972 and 1973, appropriations from the outer shelf revenues adequate to make the fund's total income \$300 million for each year would be authorized.

Presently, receipts from Outer Continental Shelf mineral leasing are estimated to be running approximately \$500 million a year or more.

REVENUES FOR NATURAL RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Income to the fund under its present funding authorization is approximating \$100 million a year. Thus, under the committee's amendment, the land and water conservation fund would receive only a relatively small share of the outer shelf revenues.

I would like to point out to the Members of the Senate that the use of a portion of the receipts from Outer Continental Shelf lands as an additional source of revenue to finance the outdoor recreation programs authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, is based on the fully tenable proposition that the revenues from one natural resource which belongs to all the people of the United States—in this instance a depleting resource—should be reinvested in outdoor recreation areas and developments which become a part of the permanent estate of the Nation for the use, benefit, and enjoyment of all of our citizens, present and future.

The committee's amendment with respect to the limited, sliding-scale portion of Outer Continental Shelf revenues represents a very real compromise. As introduced, S. 1401 would have covered into the land and water conservation fund the entire amount of the revenues from mineral leasing on the Outer Continental Shelf, and, in addition, would also have made a part of the fund the Federal share of receipts under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and the Federal share of revenues received by or on account of the Forest Service, which are disposed of pursuant to the provisions of the law set forth in 16 United States Code 499.

It was estimated that these revenues would have brought between \$2.5 and \$3 billion into the fund for use by the States and Federal agencies.

EXECUTIVE AGENCY REPORT

However, the Department of the Interior in its report on S. 1401, dated January 4, 1968, which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, stated in pertinent part:

The Department of the Interior last January in its land price escalation report estimated total Federal and State needs under the land and water conservation fund for the next 10 years at about \$3.6 billion and estimated revenues at \$987 million. On a 5-year projection those figures would be \$1.5 billion and \$460 million, respectively.

Considering the needs for recreation lands

and waters, and other demands on our national budget for defense and domestic programs, the administration recommends that a level of financing for the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the next 5 years be established at \$200 million annually, which is a total of \$1 billion. Estimated revenues for the 5-year period are \$460 million, which means that about \$540 million would need to be found from additional sources.

During the course of the comprehensive hearings the committee held on S. 1401 and related bills, evidence was presented showing conclusively that the \$200 million level annually for the limited 5-year period would not be adequate to meet the needs of the States and the Federal program. In fact, substantially greater revenues are required.

However, the committee was cognizant of the budgetary situation, and the current demands for the tax dollar for other purposes. Accordingly, the provisions for use of the Federal share of the Mineral Leasing Act and Forest Service receipts were dropped, and the authorization for Outer Continental Shelf revenues scaled down to about one-fifth or so of the income now accruing from that source.

As stated, the committee is unanimous in its finding that this new revenue is a bare minimum, if it is even that, for the needs of outdoor recreation programs of the States and the Federal Government.

APPROPRIATION PROCEDURE MUST BE FOLLOWED

Before passing on to discuss other sections of S. 1401, I want to emphasize the fact that all appropriations from the fund must go through the regular congressional appropriation procedures. There is no "open-end" or hidden financing. Every penny is under the scrutiny of the Appropriations Committees of Congress.

Other provisions of S. 1401 are aimed at offsetting, to some extent, the skyrocketing increases in land costs that almost invariably occur in every area whenever it becomes known that the Federal Government is planning on establishing a unit of the national park system there. One of these antiescalation provisions would authorize Federal agencies to enter into contracts for the purchase of land and water areas for outdoor recreation purposes in advance of actual appropriation by Congress. Such advance contract authority is limited to \$30 million a year for fiscal 1969 and 1970.

Another antiescalation provision written into the bill by the committee authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire options on lands and waters within the exterior boundaries of any area authorized by law for inclusion in the national park system. Such authority should be helpful in permitting swift administrative action to forestall the inevitable escalation in land prices as soon as the word gets out that a particular area will become a unit of the park system. The committee amendment limits the option authority to the expenditure of not more than \$500,000 in any 1 year, requires that options be for a minimum period of 2 years, and that the sums expended for its purchase must be credited toward the purchase price.

LEASE-BACK, SELL-BACK PROVISION

Another provision of potential importance in holding down the costs of the

outdoor recreation program is found in section 2 of S. 1401, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease tracts which have been acquired for inclusion within a unit of the national park system but which are not immediately needed for an outdoor recreation purpose.

The sell-back and lease-back transactions will enable the Federal Government to recoup funds spent initially for land acquisition and return them to the land and water conservation fund. Under such transactions the Federal Government will receive the benefit from the increase in the fair market value of the land after its acquisition. The Interior Department's report states that the sell-back program may yield from 40 percent to more than 100 percent of the initial acquisition cost. Lease-back transactions should yield from 4 to 7 percent of the initial land acquisition cost per year. The Secretary is required to allow the last owner of record an opportunity to match the highest bid price.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

Mr. President, before I bring these remarks to a close, I will review very briefly the background of S. 1401. The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which it amends, is based on a draft of legislation submitted to the 88th Congress by President Kennedy in February 1963. This draft legislation was, in turn, based on a most comprehensive study of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which we established in the 85th Congress. Laurance Rockefeller was appointed Chairman of the Commission by President Eisenhower. As sponsor of S. 1401, I have the strong bipartisan cosponsorship of Senators ANDERSON, KUCHEL, NELSON, SCOTT, HART, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, CLARK, and MONTOYA. Thus, from the very beginning the concept of providing this generation and future generations of Americans the means of obtaining physical, mental, and spiritual refreshment through preservation and development of their natural heritage, the great outdoors, has been without political partisanship in any way.

As I have noted, S. 1401 is in the nature of an emergency measure to aid the States and Federal agencies in maintaining and developing their authorized outdoor recreation programs. It will go a long way toward making possible the achievement of what the Congress, the Executive, and the American people have said they want done and are trying to do.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will act promptly and expeditiously on this matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the able and distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 1401.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to urge passage of S. 1401 to increase the land and water conservation fund.

We in Missouri are well aware of the urgent need to increase funds for new parkland and outdoor recreation proj-

ects. The backlog of unfunded projects in Missouri is growing much faster than the amount of available funds.

Mr. Robert L. Dunkeson, executive secretary of the Missouri Inter-Agency Council for Outdoor Recreation, told me April 2, this year:

At the present time, we have a backlog of more than \$1 million in requests which cannot have action until another allocation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund is made.

Even as we debate this issue, land costs are rising, and urban sprawl and pollution are ruining large portions of available parkland. Our efforts to protect our few remaining beautiful areas for the enjoyment of future generations may fail unless we are willing to increase our investment in the preservation of these areas. There is still time today. Tomorrow it may be too late.

In my opinion, S. 1401 is a logical answer to a pressing national need. The Continental Shelf is a diminishing national resource. It is altogether fitting that we put some of the funds from this shelf into permanent capital assets for the benefit of all citizens in all States.

I am pleased to report that Missouri has actively participated in the dollar-for-dollar matching grant program. In the 3-year period from January 1, 1965, to January 1, 1968, 124 Missouri projects qualified for assistance. These projects total \$5,113,579 and will benefit citizens in all areas of the State.

The Federal share of the land and water conservation fund is used for the acquisition of outdoor recreation land in national forests, national parks, national wildlife refuges, and other Federal recreation areas. Missouri also has benefited by Federal purchases under this program. Expenditures of the National Park Service for the Ozark National Scenic Riverways total \$3,134,990. Expenditures of the Forest Service for Clark and Mark Twain National Forests are \$1,580,474.

Though Missouri and the Nation have received much assistance from the fund the money available has fallen short of the demand.

In the very near future I plan to introduce a bill to draw up a final plan for the Lower Meramec River National Recreation Area in the Greater St. Louis region. The St. Louis area urgently needs this project. But unless funds are available when the proper time comes, this great urban area and the citizens of this Nation will lose a vital asset. S. 1401 gives assurance that the needed funds will be available.

There are a number of other important projects in Missouri which will require additional funds in coming years. S. 1401 will help provide the required Federal share of these funds on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis. Without this bill we would have to be resigned to a growing backlog of local outdoor recreation projects year after year.

Mr. President, I wish to add just one more point. The bill we debate today is just one side of the coin. This bill represents the extent of the Federal commitment to preserving beautiful segments of our Nation. This bill says the Congress and the Federal agencies are

willing to do their share of the work. But on the other side of the coin are the many local volunteer citizens and dedicated State and local officials who work tirelessly for projects in their local communities.

Their dedication to the cause of conservation, their concern for the present and future needs of their communities, their willingness to invest hundreds of hours in outdoor recreation projects should be an inspiration to us all.

In my opinion, where local men and women are willing to invest their money and their time for the benefit of their fellow citizens, the least we can do is stand behind their commitment. The issue is right at the core of our system. The land and water conservation fund program is working because there is concern and cooperation at every level and because citizens really care about keeping America beautiful.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to pass S. 1401.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I support S. 1401, as amended and reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I serve on the committee, was a cosponsor of the legislation in the 88th Congress, which established the land and water conservation fund—Public Law 88-578—am a cosponsor with Senator KUCHEL of S. 531 to extend the act, and am a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission whose purposes parallel those of the fund.

The Commission is charged with the responsibility of screening acquisitions for addition to the national wildlife refuge system. Such additions as are approved are financed with funds from the duck stamp trust fund or the donations of generous citizens. Purchases are actually negotiated by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife following Commission approval.

The Director of the Bureau, Mr. John Gottschalk, prepared at my request a summary of the recommendations of the Commission since 1960. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gottschalk's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE.

Washington, D.C., March 22, 1968.

HON. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: At the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission meeting on February 27 you requested that our staff review the history of Commission reapprovals over the last few years to obtain an indication of price increases resulting from delays in acquisitions. We have done this for reapprovals by the Commission since 1960. I believe you will find the summary of our study quite enlightening.

Under Commission procedures, a proposal is originally approved for an entire refuge on a tract by tract basis. The tract values presented are based on market value appraisals generally prepared shortly before the Commission meeting. Usually negotiations are initially on a willing seller basis and proceed over a period of years. As time passes, the initial appraisals become outdated and

the unacquired tracts are reappraised. When options to purchase are obtained at prices that exceed the previous Commission approvals, the new prices are submitted to the Commission for reapproval. These value increases result from a number of factors including the general inflation of land values which is encountered throughout the country, improvements to the specific properties by the landowners, changes in land use on the specific tract or in the general vicinity and/or unusual demand and competition for land in the area. These factors seem to particularly affect lands in coastal and metropolitan areas.

You are well aware of the frequent requests for reapproval presented to the Commission. Of all lands approved by the Commission since January 1, 1960, totaling 457,000 acres, the Commission has reapproved higher values for 92,240 acres of land comprising 694 tracts. The total reappraised value of these tracts was approximately \$17 million versus the original combined approvals of \$11.8 million. The \$5.2 million increase is 44 percent of the previous approvals. The increase averaged \$56 per acre. The previous approvals were granted from one to seven years before the reapprovals, with a lapse of two to three years in the majority of cases. This would indicate that acquisition delays are resulting in price increases from all causes of about 15 percent to 20 percent annually.

It appears that a higher rate of acquisition, requiring greater appropriation, would save money. Furthermore, in many cases, land will be destroyed as waterfowl habitat if acquisition is delayed. However, there is a rate beyond which the acquisition program should not be accelerated because of the logistics of finding competent staff and the public resistance that reacts to a large amount of condemnation. We feel we are operating substantially below an optimum rate at present.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN S. GOTTSCHALK,
Director.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, let me read one paragraph from Mr. Gottschalk's letter:

You are well aware of the frequent requests for reapproval presented to the Commission. Of all lands approved by the Commission since January 1, 1960, totaling 457,000 acres, the Commission has reapproved higher values for 92,240 acres of land comprising 694 tracts. The total reappraised value of these tracts was approximately \$17 million versus the original combined approvals of \$11.8 million. The \$5.2 million increase is 44 percent of the previous approvals. The increase averaged \$56 per acre. The previous approvals were granted from one to seven years before the reapprovals, with a lapse of two to three years in the majority of cases. This would indicate that acquisition delays are resulting in price increases from all causes of about 15 percent to 20 percent annually.

This, very briefly, has been the experience of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, of which I have been a member since 1961. I hope that it will serve to illustrate the wisdom of the committee's action on S. 1401, to extend and expand the land and water conservation fund for the acquisition of needed recreation lands.

Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], has made the case for the bill now before us in an article published in the April 1968 issue of Parks and Recreation. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRANSFUSION NEEDED: PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO BRING NEW LIFE TO THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(By HENRY M. JACKSON, U.S. Senator, Washington)

Four years ago the Congress moved impressively in response to the nation's burgeoning needs for outdoor recreation opportunities by establishing the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This was landmark legislation, designed to pump new financial blood into acquisition of park and recreation lands, waters and other facilities, and was endorsed by nearly every state, conservation group and a vast segment of the American public.

Today, the Fund is like a heart-transplant patient who rallied immediately after the operation, but suffered a relapse because of other complications.

FUND NEEDS TRANSFUSION

A new phase of Federal-State cooperation in creating outdoor opportunities for the American people has been attained, but anticipated revenues have not been realized, and spiraling increases in costs delimit the success of the Fund. Unless we can give the Fund a transfusion, it will wither and end in failure.

With Senators Anderson, Kuchel and Nelson as other sponsors, I have introduced a bill, S. 1401, to provide new revenues. These would come from unearmarked receipts from the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, excluding those from lands within naval petroleum reserves; receipts from the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953, including funds now held in escrow to the extent it is determined they belong to the United States, and from unearmarked receipts from the National Forests.

Last year these sources brought in a total of \$668,545,000.

LAND COSTS INCREASE

The members of my Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are deeply concerned—as are all branches of government—with the mounting annual increases in the price of land for public park and recreation areas.

President Johnson, in a message to Congress last year, pointed out that the average prices of land are increasing at a rate of almost ten percent a year, but that the cost of land for recreation is spiraling at a considerably higher rate.

"This diminished the effectiveness of our program of state grants and federal purchases of land for parks and recreation areas," he said. "We must act promptly to assure that we can acquire needed recreation lands before the price becomes prohibitive. The most effective means of controlling the increase in the price of land is to acquire the lands quickly after authorization by Congress."

The Department of Interior estimates the Fund may fall short by as much as \$2.7 billion in meeting minimum state and federal needs over the next decade.

CURRENT NEEDS NOT MET

This is the crux of the problem. For example, the 89th Congress alone authorized establishment of 23 new federal recreation areas involving acquisition of 250,000 acres at an estimated cost of \$119 million. Yet, due in part to rising land costs, authorized ceilings are inadequate to meet current needs.

Among outstanding areas recently authorized are Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area in Pennsylvania and New Jersey; Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore; Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area in California; Assateague Island National Seashore in Maryland and Virginia; Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in Michi-

gan; Guadalupe National Park in Texas; Cape Lookout National Seashore in North Carolina; Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in West Virginia; and Mt. Rogers National Recreation Area in Virginia.

ACQUISITION PROPOSALS PENDING

Proposals to acquire other areas are pending in Congress. The money involved is well beyond revenues accruing to the Fund. New areas recommended to the Congress by the President in 1967 include a Redwood National Park in northern California; a national park and recreation area in the North Cascades area of Washington; a Potomac Valley Park in Maryland, Virginia and West Virginia, and an Apostle Island National Lakeshore in Wisconsin. Also under consideration are a proposed wild and scenic river system and a nationwide trail system.

Authorization for new areas of the National Park System for which appropriations have not been made, plus increases in existing statutory authorizations and appropriations where no limitations exist, now total around \$318 million. Requested authorizations for new areas now being considered by Congress total around \$160 million. Thus we see, in the Park Service's dilemma alone, almost a half-billion dollars is needed.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation considered both federal and state needs over the next 10 years and concluded that the Fund will fail to meet minimum needs by around \$2.7 billion. Federal and state needs will cost approximately \$3.6 billion—not allowing for any escalation in prices—compared with only about \$900 million in anticipated revenues.

S. 1401 PROVISIONS

Fifty million dollars today will buy what \$100 million will purchase in ten years. That brings up a second important provision of S. 1401.

We should give authority to federal agencies to contract for the acquisition of property within new areas as soon as the areas are authorized. The bill would allow federal agencies to make contracts not to exceed a total of \$30 million in the next two fiscal years. This would enable the National Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to plan and negotiate land purchase contracts shortly after new recreation areas are authorized.

The need for such authority can hardly be argued. Escalation is most noticeable just before and after Congress authorizes a new national park or recreation area. Alert real estate developers and land speculators follow the progress of these bills through Congress. After a new park or recreation area is authorized, the price of land rises before Congress has appropriated any money for acquisition.

There is an average lapse of about two years between the time a bill is introduced in Congress to authorize a national recreation area and its enactment. It takes an average of another nine months to get an appropriation.

ESTABLISH PRICE PATTERN

When a new area is authorized, agencies should be able to move promptly to acquire prime tracts to reduce the impact of price escalation. This also would tend to establish a price pattern for future purchases of land in the area and bring more savings to the taxpayer.

The Senate and House Appropriations Committees, as well as the Bureau of the Budget, have not usually favored giving contract authorizations to federal agencies that are responsible for purchasing park and recreation lands.

Support for S. 1401 was overwhelming at hearings before our Committee in February. The Administration suggested an amended version of the bill, one that would increase money going into the Land and Water Conservation Fund to a level of \$200 million a year over the next five fiscal years.

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORT BILL

Even stronger support came from conservation organizations and state representatives.

The National Wildlife Federation, referring to inadequacy of the Fund, said editorially in a recent issue of its bi-monthly publication:

"To some degree, this situation results from escalating land prices but the simple truth is that the Fund is inadequate to do the job. Though several solutions have been discussed, one of two courses of action is necessary: either abandon the 'full funding' concept whereby all federal park and recreation area acquisitions are made from the Fund, or supplement the Fund with income from other sources. In view of the trouble, both abroad and here at home, it may be difficult to generate steam for either approach. However, a national park with widespread public benefits should be as meritorious as a dam or dredging project with nonreimbursable public benefits for navigation, flood control, and recreation."

Many members of Congress, I feel sure, support the sentiment of the National Wildlife Federation. The problem of finding enough money to buy parks and recreation areas authorized by Congress is a vexing one. It will not become less complex if allowed to simmer and go unsolved.

I feel we have an answer in S. 1401. I am hopeful that the Senate and House will approve the bill this year.

NRPA'S POSITION

Senate Bill 1401 and House Bill 8578 would authorize adding to the Fund outer continental shelf oil revenues, unallotted national forest and mineral leasing revenues. The Administration, in supporting these bills, would limit the additional source funds to those from the outer continental shelf, which are expected to be adequate, and would set an annual appropriation ceiling of \$200 million for five years. That would not be adequate. The foreseeable needs for Land and Water Conservation Funds during the next 10 years are between \$3 billion and \$4 billion. The National Recreation and Park Association, therefore, has recommended to Congress that the annual appropriation ceiling be raised to \$300 million and we have pointed out the 10-year foreseeable needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not very encouraging to argue my amendment when the author of the bill and the Presiding Officer are the only other Senators in the Chamber.

The bill as originally introduced by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] envisioned dedicating of all of the revenues derived from the Continental Shelf mineral production to the land and water conservation fund, plus national forest receipts and moneys produced under the Mineral Leasing Act. The Department of the Interior is never timid in asking for funds to operate the Department and all of its bureaus.

Back in 1920 the Mineral Leasing Act was passed by Congress; it granted to each State of the Union, wherein oil or minerals were discovered on public lands, 37½ percent of the receipts from the production of those minerals. Another 52½ percent of such proceeds was dedicated to the reclamation fund, for the reclamation of arid lands of the West, and so forth. Ten percent is retained by the Government for administration.

The moneys collected from all of these federally owned lands in the various internal States are spent within the boundaries of those States.

Mr. President, I have served on the Public Works Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee for 16 years. I have provided, with the approbation of the committee, millions of dollars to build dams to protect lands from floods, and the like. At each lake that was formed behind these dams, we have provided for recreation facilities, so that today we have recreation facilities all over the country. We are still in the process of providing more and more of these recreation facilities.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to programs of that kind. I have voted for and advocated the dedication of much land for the purpose of park and recreation facilities.

But the appetite of the Secretary of the Interior is insatiable. Despite the creation of the land and water conservation fund in 1965, into which now flow some \$100 million each year in revenues from national park receipts, unclaimed motorboat fuel taxes and the sale of surplus Government property, the Department of the Interior now wants to double this fund for the next 3 years, and triple it for the next 2 years.

This would be accomplished by dedicating into this fund a total of \$700 million over the next 5 years from the proceeds of mineral production on the Outer Continental Shelf.

It is important to remember, Mr. President, that at the present time these revenues flow into the general fund of the Treasury, where they are available for expenditure, by appropriation by the Congress; they are there, available to be spent for any purpose to which Congress may appropriate them. Yet, under the committee's bill, \$100 million each year would be drawn from the general fund of the Treasury, placed in the land and water conservation fund, and would remain there unless Congress appropriated these moneys for the acquisition of parkland, and similar purposes. They would no longer be available for general governmental purposes; they would be earmarked and dedicated for specific purposes of the land and water conservation fund.

Now it may be that the land and water conservation fund purposes are of vital importance, but, it is my considered opinion that despite as worthy as these purposes may be, they do not warrant the "locking in" of money which could and should remain available for appropriation by the Congress.

For this reason, I have offered an amendment which removes the dedication of funds, but which authorizes the appropriation of exactly the same amounts as proposed by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This approach seems fair and reasonable; it is exactly the same approach as is applied in the case of almost all other Federal programs. It is the same procedure which nearly every other Federal agency must follow in securing appropriations for the programs which it administers.

But, most important, it permits the

Congress to annually review the demands upon Federal funds and weigh those demands against the availability of money. It avoids the "freezing" of funds into one specific fund.

Mr. President, I have always been opposed to the earmarking of funds. In the State of Louisiana, we have had a great deal of it, and it has made it very difficult for the legislature to prudently and wisely spend the moneys available to operate the government.

Mr. President, I do not think I need remind Senators that our Nation is faced with a serious fiscal problem. Our budget will be out of balance, come June 30, by over \$20 billion. We are being called upon to impose a surtax of 10 percent on all the taxpayers of our country in order to close the gap—that is, to attempt to balance our budget, so that we will not be as deep in the red as we will be unless we impose the surtax. Yet, even as the Congress is being asked to raise revenue, this bill would siphon away revenue; this bill would, over a period of 5 years, divert \$700 million of funds that now find their way into the U.S. Treasury. It does not make sense for us to impose new taxes upon our people in one breath, and in the next breath take revenues we are now collecting and divert them—dedicate them, freeze them—for the purchase of parks.

Mr. President, I feel confident that better uses for that money can be found. But in any event, let the money continue to flow into the Treasury and let the executive department—the President—and the Congress, determine priorities in expenditure, through the normal budget process. Let us not "take out of commerce" money which our Treasury so badly needs.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works, my good friend from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] will recall that I have never failed to be fair and just in providing funds for worthwhile purposes. I believe he will agree that my subcommittee has found it possible to include on our appropriation bills many unbudgeted public works items for his own State. In fact, I exercised that privilege for practically every State of this Union, in order to see to it that each State received its just proportion of funds to develop its land and water resources.

But, I say again, Mr. President, it is unfair for the Congress, at this time, in the situation in which we find ourselves, to tie up \$100 million of funds that are now being paid into our empty Treasury.

I think it is unfair and I think it is wrong for the Department of the Interior to demand preferential treatment in utilizing our already scarce revenue to increase a fund that is now amounting to about \$100 million a year.

Mr. President, under the act which created the land and water conservation fund, there is already dedicated to the fund all fees collected at our national parks. The allocation is justified on the basis that those funds are collected by the Park Service, and the money is used to expand the parks and to make them better for the use of our people.

The land and water conservation fund also receives certain unclaimed taxes col-

lected on gasoline used in motorboats, and that produces considerable revenue.

A third source of revenue to the land and water conservation fund is the proceeds of the sale of public surplus property.

The record shows, as proponents of the bill have pointed out, that from these sources alone, the land and water conservation fund derives about \$100 million per year. Thus, over the last 3 years, there has been collected from that source some \$300 million. About \$53 million more has been appropriated, or a total of about \$400 million spent under the act during the last 3 years to provide for expansion of our park system.

Mr. President, I have never objected to the fund, as such. For instance, if the Government has surplus land that it wishes to sell, and use the proceeds to purchase land for parks, that is all right. That is in keeping with the idea of creating these recreational areas.

But, Mr. President, it makes no sense to pass a bill dedicating our already depleted revenues to park purposes—to dip further into a depleted Treasury. We might as well earmark a part of the funds to be collected under the 10-percent surtax, and tie the matter down. We might just as well do it.

Every dollar that has been collected so far from mineral production of the Continental Shelf now finds its way into the Treasury, along with other moneys collected from other sources including taxes.

With the present condition of our Treasury, when our country now owes \$360 billion, and the carrying charge on that debt is today more than \$15 billion a year, I cannot for the life of me see how the Congress can tie up this money, set it aside, dedicate it, freeze it, and bypass the responsibility of the Congress to determine what programs receive priority as to the application of our Federal revenue.

Let us not forget, Mr. President: If this bill passes in its present form, some \$700 million in income will be set aside and earmarked for the purposes indicated in the bill; if Congress does not appropriate the amount earmarked, it remains in the fund, and the Government cannot use it for other purposes. We cannot appropriate it in order to pay other expenses of Government.

It would seem to me Mr. President, that with our country so deeply involved in Southeast Asia, in Europe, and all over the world, now is not the time to earmark this source of revenue or any other source of revenue.

Mr. President, another point which I wish to bring to the attention of Congress is this: Much money this bill seeks to earmark is the subject of a controversy between the Federal Government and the State of Louisiana. As many Members of Congress know, there has been created an escrow fund into which all revenues from disputed areas off the Louisiana coast are deposited. Some of that money has been distributed. At this moment a lawsuit is pending in the Supreme Court to determine the extent to which the State of Louisiana owns any part of the money in escrow.

For this reason, too, Mr. President, I think this measure comes at a bad time. It strikes me that nothing should be done with these funds until the respective rights of the State and the Federal Government are determined.

That is, however, just a side matter as far as I am concerned. My principal objection to the freezing or dedication of these funds is the condition of our Treasury. Our Nation has been "in the red" for all practical purposes since 1933. We have balanced our budget only two or three times during that period. However, there was no legitimate balancing by any means because, as I recall, within a few months after the so-called balancing of the budget took place, we were back in the red—and in less than 60 days after the end of the fiscal year.

Let us not aggravate this situation. Let us not arbitrarily and in advance freeze or dedicate our already scarce tax revenues. This income should continue to flow into the Treasury, subject to appropriation, with the President and the Congress determining by the usual appropriation process where and how this money is to be spent.

My amendment would do just this.

Under my amendment, normal budgetary procedures would be followed. As a matter of fact, the President could at any time inform the Congress, through the Budget Bureau that he recommends so much money to be spent for park purposes. That is inherent in my amendment. Such a recommendation would, of course, go to the Appropriations Committees. The committees would then hold the hearings and pass upon the request in the same manner as they do in any other matter.

My amendment provides authorization for the appropriation of an additional \$700 million over the next 5 years to augment the land and water conservation fund, for the acquisition of parklands and similar purposes. Let me make this point clear, for I have learned that information is being passed around among many Senators to the effect that if my amendment is agreed to, the States of those Senators will lose a number of dollars because there will not be any money available to purchase land for parks that Congress has already authorized. However, that is not so. The authorization provided in my amendment is exactly the same as is the authorization contained in the committee bill. The only difference is that the committee bill would automatically dedicate this amount, where my amendment would preserve the historic and necessary power of the Congress to determine priorities in the expenditure of Federal funds, through the appropriations process.

I am strongly opposed to our earmarking these funds in advance when we may need them in many other fields—housing, the poverty program, schools, and the like. The decisionmaking as to priorities should be left to the President and to Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President,

those people who are interested in giving a high priority to recreation have a very worthwhile purpose. However, is it not true that the income that Senators would vote to dedicate to that purpose in priority to all other purposes, for example, would exclude the use of this same money to provide essential help to the kind of people who are producing this very revenue.

Let me give a simple example. Off the coast of Louisiana and Texas, where most of the oil is presently being produced, we are accustomed to hurricanes.

Hurricane Betsy alone was responsible for \$1 billion worth of property damage and for the loss of many lives. Hurricane Audrey killed about one-quarter of the population in Cameron Parish. About 390 lives were lost in that hurricane.

Many people lose their homes and their lives in these hurricanes. They are the people who are producing this income.

Can the Senator explain by what logic these people who sacrifice their lives, homes, and property to produce this income for the Federal fisc should stand second in line in receiving some help from Federal revenues derived from their labor to someone who wants a park in an inland State?

Mr. ELLENDER. I most certainly cannot, I must say, to my colleague. And I am glad he has raised this point. As I said earlier, in the States containing Federal land, the State in which the land is located receives 37.5 percent of the income yielded by those lands, to be spent for schools and roads, 52.5 percent is dedicated to reclamation within the State. Yet, as to the revenues affected by this bill, we, who are entitled to some part thereof, for reasons my colleague has just stated, receive no benefit at all—except for a small share of the total amount dedicated to the purchase of parks by this bill.

The pending bill provides that two-fifths of the amount dedicated into the land and water conservation fund would be distributed among all States on an equal basis; three-fifths would be allocated on the basis of need. However, I am not questioning the formula.

The main issue presented by my amendment, is that it is bad fiscal policy to earmark these funds.

My distinguished colleague is going to handle a tax measure in the next 2 or 3 weeks. Why is that tax measure being considered? It is because we are short of funds. Our Government does not have enough money to balance the budget, pay our debts, and funds necessary Federal programs.

We need money to support the war in Vietnam, to provide better housing, schools, et cetera. In one breath we are asking our people to pay increased taxes to provide these things. Yet, here is a source of revenue that is constantly flowing to the Treasury, to the tune of more than \$200 million a year, but we are being asked to earmark that money to build parks.

I believe that parks should be constructed, but let us do it in the normal way. Let us not earmark our already scarce tax dollars.

Let me say again that once these funds

are earmarked, they cannot be used for anything but parks. If Congress fails to appropriate the money, it will remain in the Treasury.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand, although this revenue is being generated by the efforts and the toil of citizens of Louisiana, Texas, and California, the Senator's amendment would not give those States any advantage over any other State. The amendment simply provides that the 50 States would be treated the same and that everybody who has a pet project can make equal claim on the revenue generated by the citizens of our States. It would simply provide, in effect, that the recreation program would make its claim on the Treasury in the same fashion as all others.

The Ellender amendment would provide that the recreation program would make its claim on the Federal Treasury along with the urban renewal program, along with the poverty program, along with the health program, along with the welfare program, along with the program of the people who almost at this very moment are marching on Washington to demand money. The recreation program would make its case, just as everybody else would have to make his case, to say how much could be justified.

Does the Senator see that the recreation program has any greater claim on what can be produced on the Outer Continental Shelf, by the toil of citizens of Louisiana, Texas, California, and the other coastal States, than that of many of the other desirable programs?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, if left to me and, I suppose, to my colleague, since this oil and gas, as well as sulfur, are produced along the coast of Louisiana, the State of Louisiana should have priority, in order to develop ways and means of preventing storms from doing the damage they have done in the past.

Furthermore, there is no doubt but that the mineral development in that area has caused many fishermen and many of the oyster producers to suffer, because of the presence of the oil wells and gas wells in that area. In my opinion, if any preference is to be given with respect to that money, it should be given to the area in which these products are produced, in which the damage is occurring. I agree with my colleague that we should be given preference.

What I am saying, Mr. President (Mr. GRIFFIN in the chair)—I cannot repeat it too often—is that the amendment now being considered will not deprive the land and water conservation fund of any funds; it merely requires that these moneys be appropriated in the usual manner, and not dedicated or frozen to any particular purpose. I do not wish to tie these funds up. If the money is dedicated to that fund and if it is not approved for expenditure, it must remain there, and the Government will not be able to use it at all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As between resources which might claim a priority on the funds produced from beneath the sea, as between the water resources of the country and the land resources of the country, I ask my colleague if he would consider which resources have a

better claim and which resources have been more neglected from the conservation point of view.

With respect to the water resources, one can look at a lake such as Lake Erie, which, according to those who border it, is a cesspool today because of abuse of the water resource of that area.

Look at the Potomac River. If one's son falls from a boat into the Potomac River, the doctor may isolate him for a week, for fear that he has acquired typhoid or hepatitis, because of the horrible pollution of this great national asset.

Today, at Waikiki Beach, with no oil production within a thousand miles, the swimmers come out of the water covered with oil.

Just the other day, off San Juan, P.R., a ship that was transporting oil broke up; and the beaches are in such condition that they cannot be used. It has virtually destroyed the value of those beaches for a long time, and some of the damage might last indefinitely.

We are told that we need \$50 billion to clean up the pollution that is flowing into the seas from the United States alone. Our water resources are the most abused and neglected resources of America. With respect to a resource that can claim a priority, would it not seem logical, if we were going to assign a priority, to say, "Let the resources from the land beneath the water pay to overcome the horrible damage man has done to water resources, before using the money for another resource which, relatively speaking, is in much better shape?"

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree completely with my colleague. That should be the case. But, unfortunately, we are dealing now with a department of Government that is not timid in demanding what it desires in order to expand its own facilities.

We spend several hundred million dollars a year in reclamation, as the Senator knows; and in connection with all this reclamation we have many parks and many recreation centers.

To me, it is a question of priorities at this time. As I pointed out earlier, the moneys now being yielded by the sources of revenue now dedicated to the land and water conservation fund aggregate approximately \$100 million each year. Over the past 3 years, these sources have yielded approximately \$300 million. The estimate is that for the next 5 years they will produce over a half billion dollars. That should be a sufficient amount of money earmarked for that purpose.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator. It seems to me that the situation, when fully debated, is absolutely undeniable. This recreation program has no claim on the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf. If one is thinking in terms of priority, who has the better priority? Other priorities could make a much more equitable claim on the funds than could the recreation program. That program is a desirable one. It should be given its share of national assets—not necessarily ahead of certain other programs, not necessarily ahead of national defense or other important programs that the Nation must have in order to

survive, but as a part of the overall distribution of national assets.

I agree with the Senator that this recreation program does not have a claim superior to that of education. It does not have a claim superior to repairing the despoliation and the damage that presently is being done by producing oil in the sea, for example. It has no claim greater than correcting the pollution that is draining into these areas from the landlocked parts of this Nation.

Therefore, as far as priorities are concerned, on a deep analysis, there are other things that could claim a higher priority to the revenue.

As I understand the argument of my colleague [Mr. ELLENDER], he contends this should be considered as a desirable program which should be allowed its share of the national assets, without earmarking the Outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my argument. When the Senator brings in a tax measure, such as I understand is now being considered in committee—and I do not know whether a bill will be reported or not, but assuming that one is—it would be poor practice to earmark so much of that bill for pollution control, let us say, or housing, or this, or that.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Senate Committee on Appropriations for 14 years or so, I increased budget estimates as to many programs for California—I see the distinguished Senator from California in the Chamber—and for Oregon and for Washington because I thought it necessary to do so if we were to properly develop our land and water resources. This money was appropriated from Treasury, in the normal, usual way. The same system should govern expenditures for parkland acquisition; if there is any preference to be given, let the Congress decide the matter. Let us not earmark money in such a way that if it is not appropriated the money must remain unexpended and unused.

There is only one other point I wish to emphasize and that deals with the matter of giving the Secretary of the Interior the right to sell lands acquired for park purposes, with the profit derived from such sales dedicated into this fund, to be used as the Secretary of the Interior determines. My good friend from Washington did not go into much detail about that matter.

I am wondering why it is necessary to permit the Secretary of the Interior to speculate with lands he purchases. If he buys lands from this fund, I assume that the land is deemed necessary for recreational purposes. Why would he be permitted to take that same land and dispose of it for a profit, and permit that profit to go back to the fund? I cannot see the purpose of doing that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand the bill, it would earmark \$1.2 billion over the next 5 years to be placed in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill would do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would bring the amount up to that total?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would, because revenue already dedicated into the land and water conservation fund will yield some \$500 million over the next 5 years. It is now proposed to augment this sum by dedicating, from Outer Continental Shelf revenues, an additional \$700 million, making a total of \$1.2 billion. That is the amount, in the view of the committee, necessary in order to pay for lands, improving parks, and so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding. The existing law provides for about \$500 million over the next 5 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Five hundred million dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. From the tax on the sale of motor fuel.

Mr. ELLENDER. And from the sale of surplus lands.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And surplus lands.

That is under the existing law.

Mr. ELLENDER. And fees from parks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And fees from parks.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. However, in addition to this \$700 million, more would be added, bringing the total to \$1.2 billion, all of which would be taken out of the offshore revenues.

Why not let that money go into the Treasury? Why start earmarking this money anyway?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I have been talking about for the last half hour. I do not see any reason why it should be done. It should not be done.

I again wish to emphasize that my amendment would authorize, subject to appropriations, the expenditure of an additional \$700 million in the next 5 years over and above the money already dedicated to the land and water conservation fund. Thus, under my amendment, Congress would be authorized to appropriate as much as \$200 million each year for the next 3 years and \$300 million each year for the following 2 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. At a time when we are discussing cutting back on spending and rescinding outstanding obligational authority I wonder if we should not hold this entire matter in abeyance until we can see if we have enough money to pay for it. As I see it, this proposal would go beyond budget recommendations in establishing obligational authority. I do not believe they asked for this \$700 million extra to begin with, did they?

Mr. ELLENDER. The original bill asked that the entire amount yielded by the Outer Continental Shelf be dedicated for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand the original bill asked for more, but I was speaking of the Budget Bureau itself. I understand it did not approve the original bill. I had the understanding it did not approve increasing the amount to \$300 million for the later 2 years.

This bill calls for \$200 million more than was requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. JACKSON. The report of the De-

partment of the Interior, which stated the position of the Bureau of the Budget, recommended \$200 million a year for 5 years. That would be \$1 billion in all. S. 1401 as I introduced it, as the able senior Senator from Louisiana pointed out, would have made available all of the funds from the Outer Continental Shelf, plus the funds from the Forestry and Mineral Leasing Act, appropriation by the Congress for Land and Water Conservation Act purposes.

The Interior Committee unanimously, in marking up the bill, amended it to provide for a maximum of \$200 million a year for the first 3 years, and \$300 million for the final 2 years of the 5-year period.

Therefore, the answer to the Senator's question is that the Bureau of the Budget approved a total of \$1 billion, for 5 years, and the committee \$1.2 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding.

Mr. JACKSON. The amendment which is now pending, offered by the Senator from Louisiana, would simply authorize the same amount of \$1.2 billion but the money would come out of general receipts.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; \$700 million out of general receipts and \$500 million from revenues already earmarked for the land and water conservation fund.

Mr. JACKSON. The total is \$1,200 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. But \$500 million of that comes from revenues dedicated to the fund in the 1965 act.

Mr. JACKSON. The same applies in the bill as reported by the Interior Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. \$100 million, roughly, is the amount that now comes from the sales of surplus Federal real property, the motorboat fuel tax, and the entrance and user fee system under existing law. So there can be said to be a deficit of about \$100 million, and this deficit would be met by making available a relatively small proportion of receipts from the Outer Continental Shelf. For the first 3 years, this amount might be as much as \$100 million, and for the last 2 years as much as \$200 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct; but we are still back at the point where, if we pass the bill or adopt the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana the Senate would be approving obligational authority for \$200 million beyond what the Bureau of the Budget asked for and it has never been known to be hesitant in asking for enough. We would be increasing this amount at a time when we are talking about the need for canceling or rescinding the existing obligational authority. As recently as 3 weeks ago the Senate approved a bill containing an amendment directing the administration to scale down its expenditures by \$6 billion and reduce the requested obligational authority for fiscal 1969 by another \$10 billion.

If we pass this bill it seems to me that that would be completely contradictory. I am wondering whether the proper action would not be to reject the bill entirely and let the agency function with the same amount of money it has had in

years past; namely, approximately \$100 million a year. That should be enough until such time as we can find out whether there will be enough money in the Treasury to pay for the proposal.

Mr. ELLENDER. Congress can authorize an additional \$700 million above the amount now dedicated to the fund, but the agency would have to come to Congress, and Congress would have to appropriate the funds; Congress would judge the merits of the case at that time, and set its own priorities. Certainly I could name many uses for the money. All of us would like to have more money spent for parks. It strikes me, though, that a number of other purposes might be more pressing at this time.

One thing I wish to emphasize is that if this bill, as reported, should pass and should Congress fail to appropriate the money that the bill earmarks, that money cannot be used for any other purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana up to this point: If we are to spend this amount—I emphasize the word "if"—it is better to do it through the normal, standard process of appropriations than to earmark the money so that \$1,250 million would automatically flow into the hands of one bureaucrat without the necessity of the annual supervision which the program would receive if it had to be considered by the Committee on Appropriations each year.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To the Appropriations Committee and the Congress as a whole.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I think that one thing should be made very clear. The bill provides only for authorization and not for appropriation. It is authorization with an earmarking proviso. The Appropriations Committee will determine how much money will go into the fund, and then they have to appropriate the money each year out of the fund. I want to point out that so far as earmarking is concerned—and this is a bookkeeping process—if Congress fails to appropriate the money earmarked after 2 years, the money goes back into the general funds of the Treasury, so that there is no money accumulated and lying idle. The Appropriations Committee has full review.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I should like to ask the Senator, do I correctly understand that if the Senate decides to earmark the funds, and at the end of 2 years they are not appropriated, then the earmarking means nothing; that it disappears?

Mr. JACKSON. The money goes back to the general fund of the Treasury, so that there is no earmarking after 2 years. Section 3 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, which is set forth on page 26 of the committee report on S. 1401, reads as follows:

SEC. 3. APPROPRIATIONS.—Moneys covered into the fund shall be available for expendi-

ture for the purposes of this Act only when appropriated therefor. Such appropriations may be made without fiscal-year limitation. Moneys covered into this fund not subsequently authorized by the Congress for expenditures within two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such moneys had been credited to the fund, shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. Where does the Senator find that in the bill?

Mr. JACKSON. It is in the basic law. Section 3 of the act of September 3, 1964, title I—Land and Water Conservation Provisions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true, but this bill goes beyond that and says that certain of the funds necessary to bring it up to a certain amount are automatically turned over to an agency's fund.

Mr. JACKSON. To the fund. But Congress then must appropriate the money from the fund. I want to make that very clear.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We hear the argument made around here that authorizations really do not cost money because Congress has to appropriate the money later, and if it does not appropriate it or does not approve the spending it does not cost anything. The Senator I am sure will agree with me that once we approve an authorization, when an appropriation request is made, we are told we are reneging on the authorization if we do not appropriate the full amount. So authorizations do mean something, or at least they should mean something, although I agree that it does not give authority to spend.

It is somewhat like the argument we are now having with the departments and the Budget Bureau in conference on the tax bill where we find them willing to cancel authorizations and obligational authority of \$15 billion or \$20 billion. I pointed out that even if we did that we could spend in fiscal 1969 just as much money under the existing \$180 billion obligational authority already on the books. It would be a long-range savings. But the point I am making here is, Why do we keep piling up obligational authority over and beyond the money we have with which to pay for it?

This expanding of obligational authority does mean larger spending in the later years.

I shall vote against this bill unless this new obligational authority of \$700 million is deleted from the bill.

Why should we approve a bill here today extending obligational authority an extra \$700 million in the next 5 years, over and beyond the existing law, and extend it \$200 million over and beyond what even the Budget Bureau with all its great imagination could even think they could possibly use or ask for? I think the very least we can do is to hold the line at the existing level of spending.

Mr. ELLENDER. I simply wish to say that the appropriation would have to come back to Congress, and I can see no reason why we should not at least authorize the amount recommended by the committee, since the Senator from Washington thinks it is so necessary. But what I am opposed to is the earmarking of

funds, since, among other things, this matter is in litigation between the State of Louisiana and the Federal Government. I think we should wait at least until that is settled once and for all.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Is there not a precedent involved in earmarking this particular source of funds? Is it customary to do so?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I do not readily recall any except perhaps the act of 1965 which earmarked to the land and water conservation fund the proceeds derived from fees collected from parks, unclaimed motorboat gasoline taxes, and from the sale of surplus property.

Mr. MURPHY. Might not that prove to be a very dangerous precedent as a new source of funding?

Mr. ELLENDER. It certainly would.

Mr. MURPHY. I cannot predict the total wealth that lies off the coasts. I know a little bit about some of the explorations which have gone on offshore in my State. But we have no idea. Now, there may be other sources of income, but if it becomes a practice to earmark, I would think it would be a very dangerous one because the priorities, at the present moment—that is, this year and next year—may not be the priorities of the year after next. They may change next week.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. That is the burden of my argument.

Mr. MURPHY. I would say that I would have a difficult time explaining that to the people of the State of California.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. We would have a hard time, with the march on Washington coming up perhaps next May, with the poor people needing this, that, and the other things, and the need for housing, and need for schools, justifying the dedication of \$700 million to parks.

Mr. MURPHY. I would think so.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the burden of my arguments.

Mr. President, there is not too much more to say about my amendment, but I would like to discuss with the Senator from Washington the selling back and leasing back of these properties.

Has the Senator any examples wherein the Department has gone into the business of speculating in land? For example, should a piece of property be purchased for \$1 million and sold for \$2 million, the profit would go to this fund without accounting. Am I correct in that?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, what we are trying to do here is give authority to the Secretary of the Interior to deal with those situations arising from so-called in-holdings within the external boundaries of units of the national park system, which have been acquired as a part of the overall program, but for which there is no immediate Federal need. Under S. 1401, the Secretary would have authority to dispose of such a tract, instead of just carrying it. The receipts from such a sale or lease would go into the fund.

All of these sale or lease receipts will

be all strictly accounted for. Again, the Appropriations Committee would have to appropriate the funds from such receipts.

I think the granting of this authority makes sense.

Likewise, as the Senator from Louisiana knows—and he has been extremely helpful in connection with the appropriation of funds for acquisition of private lands—we have run into a serious price escalation situation in this country. I must say that one of the classic examples happens to be in the State of California. I believe that for the Point Reyes National Seashore Park there was authorized an appropriation of something like \$14 million. However, land prices in the area escalated up to a total of about \$57 million. That is where it stands right now.

We face a serious situation in this country in connection with the escalation of land values for outdoor recreation.

The able Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], chairman of the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has done an outstanding job in this area. His hands will be tied unless some authority is given to the Secretary to deal with this problem in a prudent way.

We have explored various alternatives. I must say the approach here is one that I think makes a lot of sense. The committee was unanimous in its recommendation to give the authority, as provided in the bill, to purchase property in advance and also to obtain options.

I think such provisions are merely of good management. If we do not do this, the Federal Government will be paying more than it should be paying for property that must be acquired for the authorized outdoor recreation program.

Mr. President, I should just like to comment briefly on the pending amendment. The able Senator from Louisiana is in agreement, as I understand it, with the amount that needs to be authorized over the next 5 years. His figures and those provided for in the pending bill are the same; namely, \$200 million for the first 3 years, in effect, and \$300 million for the last 2 years, or a total of \$1.2 billion.

Mr. President, I fully understand the feeling of and, in fact, the strong position taken by both Senators from Louisiana, regarding the possible use for State purposes of the receipts from Outer Continental Shelf lands adjacent to State boundaries. I want to point out that the question of the availability of these funds from the Federal Outer Continental Shelf was thoroughly debated and discussed back in 1953. In that year the Congress did two things. First, it ceded to the States the so-called tidelands. That distance went out to the 3-mile limit in most States, and in other States it went beyond that, depending on the boundaries with which they came into the Union as in the case of Texas, or in their State constitution as approved by Congress, which is the case with respect to the west coast of Florida.

However, the points at which the boundary lines begin have been in dispute. A case involving Louisiana's boundary has gone to the Supreme Court, as

the Senator from Louisiana pointed out. There is now a lawsuit pending in the Supreme Court, I believe, regarding the share of a certain amount of receipts from the sale of leases in the Outer Continental Shelf. That money, incidentally, is held in trust, or escrow.

I may point out at this time that the total amount involved is a little over \$1 billion. The exact amount is \$1,027,895,388.18 as of January 31, 1968.

Mr. President, can we stipulate on the figures?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, Mr. President. I have figures, as of November 30, 1967, of \$1,102,925,657.98.

Mr. JACKSON. Anyway, let us agree that it is over \$1 billion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. That is in escrow. As the Senator knows, the bill pending before the Senate, S. 1401, exempts the escrow funds from any earmarking, unless they are decided by the court, of course, to be Federal funds. I am referring to section (d) of the text of S. 1401, as amended by the committee.

At the bottom of page 2 the pending bill states:

For the purposes of this subsection, revenues shall include the funds held in escrow under the interim agreement of October 12, 1958, between the United States and the State of Louisiana to the extent the United States is determined to be entitled to such escrow funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. I pointed that out.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is one point I want to make, which I failed to do. During the debate on the bill in 1953, the Senator will remember, if he was here—

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, I was. It was the first year I was in the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. An effort was made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama to earmark the proceeds of offshore mineral development for educational purposes. The Senate failed to do it—

Mr. JACKSON. The Senate approved the Hill "oil for the lamps of learning" amendment. The House refused to go along, and it had to be dropped.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Congress failed to approve it, the idea being that none of these funds should be earmarked, particularly those that are destined for the general fund of the Treasury.

Let me also say one other thing to my friend from Washington. I have been told that a number of Senators have received notice that unless they voted for this measure, their States would lose various sums of money for park purposes. As I understand it, every bill that has so far been passed suggesting the creation of a park has had an open authorization, authorizing Congress to appropriate the money for that purpose. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me that what ought to take place is that those interested in that matter should come before Congress, or get from the Bureau of the Budget an estimate of how much should be appropriated, and get it done in the normal way, instead of coming in and asking that these funds be earmarked in advance for that purpose.

Let me hasten to add, Mr. President, that there is probably already ample authority for the appropriation of funds for parks already authorized by Congress, but rather than rely solely on that principle, I have attempted in my amendment to preserve the intent and purpose of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in reporting this bill, while, at the same time, removing the objectionable features, principally, the earmarking, or dedication in advance of revenues to specified purposes.

This, it seems to me, is the only prudent manner, the only businesslike manner, in which to operate the land and water conservation fund. It already enjoys some \$100 million per year in dedicated funds. It would be manifestly wrong for the Senate to, in effect, double this amount, and, at the same time, further freeze the purposes for which scarce Federal revenues can be spent.

I urge Senators to support the amendment which I have offered today. Let me emphasize again that it seems to me it comes with poor grace for the Senate, having just a few weeks ago told all of the taxpayers of the United States that they must pay a 10-percent surtax because of the dire financial circumstances which confront our country, to then turn right around and dedicate to park purposes funds which would otherwise be available for the payment of general Government obligations. It is neither just, fair, nor sound business practice for us to divert seven hundred million dollars over the next 5 years into a special fund, with limited purposes and limited objectives.

Our Nation confronts a fiscal crisis; we face tremendous demands for the expenditure of tax moneys. We are supporting a war in Vietnam. The President of the United States has called for increased expenditures for slum clearance, job training, improved housing, and similar purposes. Our Treasury runs the greatest deficit in the history of the United States.

Under the circumstances, we cannot afford to dedicate to limited and special purposes moneys which would otherwise be credited to the general fund of the Treasury and be available for appropriation for such general purposes as the Committees on Appropriations and the Congress, together, might determine.

I urge the adoption of my amendment, Mr. President. We must require the funds provided for parkland purposes, or any other purposes, be handled in the normal way, by the appropriations process.

Mr. JACKSON. Of course, Mr. President, that is procedure that would have to be followed in connection with the pending measure. All expenditures from it would have to be authorized and appropriated by Congress, which means that the Committee on Appropriations would have to take the necessary action through regular appropriation procedures.

To return, however, to the fundamental question, on which I fully understand the views of the able Senator from Louisiana, it is the matter that we debated at length in 1953, as to whether or not the funds from the Outer Continental Shelf, which is Federal property,

should be made available to the adjoining States.

Mr. President, that matter was thoroughly debated and discussed, and as a result, we wrote into the law at that time, in the Outer Continental Shelf Act, the following language:

The provisions of this section for adoption of State law as law of the United States shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction on behalf of any State for any purpose over the seabed and subsoil of the Outer Continental Shelf, or the property and natural resources thereof or the revenues therefrom.

Mr. President, that language, as I read it, is completely unequivocal. I think Congress met this issue 15 years ago head on. It was agreed, after Congress had made available the so-called tide-lands, out to the 3-mile limit, and farther in the case of States which had a special historic situation that justified a greater area, that the mineral resources of the lands beyond that point were Federal property, and the adjoining States were not to lay claim to such property or any revenue therefrom.

So, Mr. President, what we are really talking about here is the earmarking of funds from Federal mineral development on the Outer Continental Shelf. These funds derive primarily from the sale of oil leases—there are sulfur leases also, I believe—so that all of the States can participate in the revenue that becomes available from time to time from the sale of the leases.

Under the Land and Water Conservation Act which this bill seeks to amend, funds will be made available for certain projects within the 50 States. The amounts are determined year by year by the Committee on Appropriations with the approval of Congress.

So I think the question of the rights of the adjoining States was settled in 1953.

Mr. President, I come from a State, the State of Washington, in which they have sold some oil leases. It is true that we have not had much luck, as they have had on the gulf. I hope we shall have better luck in the future.

But I think our people understand that decision that was made in 1953. It seems to me, that matter having been resolved, the real question is as to whether or not it is desirable to make a portion of these funds available for the 50 States. The law permits a 60-40 division, with as much as 15-percent variation either way.

Mr. President, in addition, as I have pointed out, the money, in part—as determined by the Committee on Appropriations, within the provisions of the law—can be used to make funds available to the Federal agencies that have Federal properties within the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Act.

Mr. President, one of the real reasons why the Rockefeller Commission, headed by Laurence Rockefeller, recommended very strongly the earmarking of funds, was to make it possible for the States to plan ahead. This is not dissimilar to the highway fund, under which the States are given some guidelines, so that they can plan ahead in appropriating money to meet their part of the Federal highway program.

That is precisely what we are trying to do here for outdoor recreation. Mr. President, we had representatives in from the States, and they made the point over and over again that they needed some kind of a guideline, to know what the next 5-year program of the United States would be regarding the availability of Federal funds. I think one of the very fine things in connection with the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act is that it encourages the States to put up money, to meet the matching provisions in the Federal act.

My own State passed a bond referendum 4 years ago, which provides a very substantial sum of money for park and recreation development, including funds to be available, to be matched under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Act.

I think it is quite clear that our approach in S. 1401 does help to give to the States the kind of guidance they need. In addition, Mr. President, there is a long list of precedents in connection with the earmarking of funds from the sale of Federal property, whether it is in the form of land or whether it is in the form of that which is extracted from the lands—timber, minerals, and so on.

It is true, Mr. President, that in the past the earmarking of the funds has been for the Federal Government to receive a portion and the States, and certain political subdivisions within the States, a certain portion of the money. The precedents that the able senior Senator from Louisiana referred to, in which the States participated, of course, related to lands solely within the boundaries of the States. We are now addressing ourselves to lands that are not within any State, but are, indeed, on the Outer Continental Shelf, these lands are not within the boundaries nor the jurisdiction of any of the adjoining States.

So, Mr. President (Mr. Moss in the chair), I think it is a very fair rule that we seek to apply here.

I must say that the bill, especially as substantially cut back from the way it was introduced, is a moderate one and is one in which the States especially will have the kind of broad guidelines they need in order to carry on their share of the development of park lands, recreation lands, seashore lands, and so forth.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if I recall correctly, when the State of Washington and other great Western States were carved out of the Federal domain, there was a large amount of land which was not being constructively used. No one was living on a great deal of it.

The Federal Government did not seek to exclude that from the boundaries of the State. The Federal Government included that land within the boundaries of the State, and in laws subsequently passed, it was provided that of the minerals produced from those lands, 37½ percent would go directly to those States—such as the great State of Washington—10 percent, I believe, would go to administration, and the other 52½

percent would go into a reclamation fund to provide power and bring water on those lands.

In effect, those Western States which contain most of this land have received nearly all of the benefit from all minerals produced there.

I have never heard anyone from Louisiana complain about that. Louisiana was a member of the Union before any of those States were. However, we went along with that program. Those States have had the full benefit of taking the mineral resources and using them to develop further the land and resources.

With regard to the Outer Continental Shelf areas, in many instances the Federal Government had to go first and seek to force the States out of those areas.

Louisiana, for example, had claimed land extending far beyond the claim of the Federal Government. The Federal Government did not seek to provide that that was Federal land, as it logically could have done and as it could do with any land beneath ocean water. It pursued the thought that this was an area in which the Federal Government had paramount rights.

Even so, to produce the minerals from this land is not like finding a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. Somebody has to work. Somebody has to take the risk. Somebody has to risk capital. Some people have to risk their lives. Some people have to invest their labor in it.

There are problems that go along with the development of those resources. A very considerable amount of pollution occurs in spite of the best efforts of the companies to keep it down. However, when one finds a source of large amounts of revenue out there, the parallel to the very fine program that has invested so much money in developing these Western States which have large public domains of Federal land, would be to take money that is received from minerals found on the Outer Continental Shelf and invest that money in developing the potential of the water as well as those submerged lands. If we were to do that we would be moving toward the development of the fantastic potential of the sea.

I am informed by people who claim to know something about the subject, and who are supposed to be experts in it, that the sea could produce 100 times as much food as it produces now. One would think that at a minimum something should be done to clean up the pollution that flows into the sea and that occurs in the sea.

One would think that a program of this sort would be parallel to the kind of program that exists with regard to the reclamation States.

Would it not seem, that in fairness and justice, the coastal States should be entitled to be considered in a fashion parallel to the treatment afforded those inland States into which the Federal Government saw fit to put large domains of federally owned land.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, first let me say it should be pointed out that prior to the Submerged Lands and Outer Shelf Acts the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the so-called

tidelands, from the low water mark, on out to the outer shelf, were not the property of the States. Rather they were under Federal jurisdiction.

However, Congress saw fit to make a gift of the areas within States seaward boundaries to the coastal States.

The Senator from Louisiana did not refer to that as a part of this overall settlement of the submerged lands issue. I must say that the amounts involved were substantial indeed. Certainly, as time goes on, several billions of dollars will be received. Then, having given a rich portion to the coastal States, Congress passed the Outer Continental Shelf Act and wrote into the law, as part of that settlement, the provision that I mentioned before.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator quote that provision?

Mr. JACKSON. Paragraph 3 of section 1333 of title 43 of the United States Code reads as follows:

(3) The provisions of this section for adoption of State law as the law of the United States shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction on behalf of any State for any purpose over the seabed and subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf, or the property and natural resources thereof or the revenues therefrom.

Mr. President, this provision was included because we wanted to make sure, since the States had obtained everything out to the 3-mile limit, and beyond in the case of certain States, on a complete quitclaim basis, that additional claims should not be made to the Outer Continental Shelf.

That decision was made in unequivocal terms in 1953. We are now discussing it again in 1968, and I must say that I think Congress understood at that time that some effort would be made to earmark these funds for the adjoining States. And as the Senator knows, in the hearings in executive session at that time, when we met to mark up the bill, it was anticipated that this question would be raised. So the Interior Committee in the 83d Congress, as a matter of clarification, after a discussion in the markup wrote in that particular provision I have just quoted plus language in the record to corroborate further the position of the committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, that is the second time I have heard the Senator misconstrue that very provision he has read. I corrected him when he did it before, and I will correct him again. I hope that eventually the Senator will agree with me on what the language is intended to mean.

I was on the committee and supported that very amendment to which the Senator makes reference. Those of us who represent coastal States made very much of the point that there were a great number of places where there would be no body of law applicable on the Continental Shelf if we did not let the laws of those coastal States apply in those areas. For example, the Federal Government has no law against murder unless it is the murder of the President. So, we said that the body of State law would apply and the State boundaries would be extended for that purpose.

It was said that provision was not to be regarded as a claim of the State to that property.

The Senator did construe that provision as saying that the States foreswore themselves of all claim they had or any interest in that property because it adjoined their boundaries, because it was their people who were working to produce it, and because from that very land very serious problems were involved. Nothing of that sort was intended.

As a matter of fact, I believe former Senator Cordon was the one who insisted on that particular language being in the bill. He supported the overall language, of course, just as I did.

We felt that State law should apply where there was no law to apply to those particular problems otherwise. It was extended on that basis, so that for the purpose of determining whose workmen's compensation law would apply, the State boundaries would be extended. But the States in no wise, by virtue of that, agreed, accepted, or made any commitment that they would not assert in the future that they had an interest in this matter and that they were concerned about it. The people who are producing the very wealth that the Senator is seeking to pour into his fund are happy to be citizens of those States; and those States are providing police protection, educational services, and the highways over which the equipment to develop this Continental Shelf must necessarily move.

I am not asserting for the purpose of this debate, at this point, that the States should get directly the 37½ percent that would go to a State such as Washington, on Federal lands located therein. But I do say that the States that adjoin the Continental Shelf have an interest parallel to the interest that the upland States have with regard to Federal lands located in those States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Senator has made a very ingenious argument. I have not said anything about any kind of bilateral agreement between the affected States and the Federal Government.

Obviously, what Congress did was of a unilateral nature—that is, it is a declaration by Congress so far as what Congress had in mind at that time. This Congress cannot bind future Congresses. I wish to make that clear. I wish to make very clear that I do not believe that the State of Louisiana was bound—I do not believe their Representatives or Senators were bound—by the language that I have quoted. It is not in the nature of a contract or a compact that can never be obligated or terminated. It is not that at all.

Obviously, all it is is a statement in a statute, and it is law, together with the language in the report, that made clear what Congress had in mind so far as the Federal lands on the Outer Continental Shelf.

We anticipated in our discussions that a claim would be made at some time for revenues or for the land, and we wanted to make clear that this should not be done in the terms of the proposed legislation that we approved.

I do not disagree with the Senator

about his State or any other State being bound. Obviously, we could not do that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator contend that that language precludes coastal States from asking in the future that some revenues from this area should be used to help provide hurricane protection, for example?

Mr. JACKSON. No; absolutely not. There is no doubt that the language of the statute, being statutory, can be amended and changed by Congress at any time. The Representatives have the right, under our Constitution, to make any kind of claim to it.

I merely wanted to make clear the legislative history, in the form of the language in the report, the debate and discussion, and then the statutory language that we had in mind, that claims would be made, and that we did not want any of the language conferring on the Outer Continental Shelf the application of State law where Federal law applied to be interpreted as giving to the States any right to claim revenue or property in that area.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let us see if we understand each other about this matter, because it is very important that all Members of Congress understand it.

This particular provision was sought by coastal States. Louisiana supported it. I, as a Senator from Louisiana, supported it. We contended that the State law should be applicable beyond the State boundary in this area and that the State boundary should be extended for that purpose. Those who went along with the States in this matter said, "Fine. We are willing to make the State law applicable in the area, but we want it understood that the fact that we make the State law applicable there shall not serve as a basis for the State to claim that it owns that property or that we owe the State money."

That does not mean that the State cannot claim for a thousand other reasons that it has some interest or why it should be considered in the distribution of the revenue that comes from that area.

For example, if the people of Louisiana develop those resources, Louisiana is entitled to ask for some consideration for that reason, whether they get any or not. If the people of some other State develop those resources, they are entitled to ask for consideration; or they are entitled to say that when that area is developed and resources are extracted from it, either all or some part of those resources should be directed to repairing the damage that is done in extracting those resources, such as the pollution of the water and the destruction of the potential of that area to produce oysters, shrimp, or other marine life.

Nothing in the language precludes coastal States from saying, "As you deplete this resource"—and it will not last forever—"please invest some of this revenue in helping to increase the yield of the sea; so that when we look to the day that no longer do our people have jobs on the oil rigs, they can perhaps have jobs manning fishing boats to fertilize the sea, to farm the sea, to plant it and harvest it, so that there will be a much bigger yield, and the people in the coastal

States can have some benefit from the fact that the Federal Government does own or control it."

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I reiterate again that, obviously, Congress does not have the authority, by statute, to bind a State in a situation such as we are discussing. I have never contended that. I have merely related all this to indicate the legislative history behind the enactment of the legislation involving the Outer Continental Shelf.

I must say that I fully understand the feelings of the two very able Senators from Louisiana regarding the land that adjoins their tidelands on the Outer Continental Shelf.

At the same time, I must say that, based on all the precedents, when one is dealing with a situation involving Federal property that is not within the confines of any one State, I believe we are very properly dealing with an entirely different precedent. This is especially so, Mr. President, when we take into consideration that, as a part of this legal settlement by Congress, Congress gave to the States billions of dollars of Federal property in the form of tidelands out to the 3-mile limit, and beyond, in the case of certain States. This is a part of the entire matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator is in error with respect to that. That was not a part of this bill about which the Senator is talking.

Mr. JACKSON. They were two separate bills, but together they formed the overall settlement of the submerged lands issue.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They were two separate bills. I voted for one and against the other. One bill provided for what would be done about the 3-mile limit along the boundaries of those States.

Mr. JACKSON. The only reason why I raised this question is that the able junior Senator from Louisiana had pointed out that in the case of the Mineral Leasing Act, the States get a certain proportion of the receipts, and, therefore, why should not the same apply on the Outer Continental Shelf?

I hasten to add that in order to discuss the Outer Continental Shelf, one must point out that the Federal Government made a gift of lands outright, Federal lands worth billions of dollars, to the tideland States. I believe that fact must be taken into consideration in any sensible discussion of this overall problem.

The Federal Government itself made Federal lands available to certain States in the Union for school purposes and other purposes over a period of time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. While the Senator is relating all of that, let us make this matter clear. For more than a hundred years the Federal Government did not claim the lands; the States claimed them. When Secretary Ickes decided to claim them, and the Supreme Court decided to go along with him, the States came in and said they thought they should be given better consideration than that and Congress agreed to it.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not wish to retry

the tidelands case. That case went on for days and days.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I did not bring up that point. The Senator has been reading from a provision under which he gave the impression he was trying to contend that the Outer Continental Shelf Act provided that the coastal States shall assert no claim and have no interest in the Outer Continental Shelf. If that is what the Senator had in mind he could not be more wrong if he were working at being wrong, because that provision was placed in the law with the urging, suggestion, and votes of the coastal States to see that their laws would apply in that area. It has been said that the fact that we made the State law applicable here shall not serve as a basis for the State claiming an interest. That did not mean that a State was not asking for equity and justice, parallel to what has been done for reclamation States. That was not intended and I hope the Senator does not think that it is what was intended because he will look in vain for support for that argument.

Mr. JACKSON. Many of the Senators who are now in the Chamber are lawyers. Obviously, the 83d Congress in 1953 could not bind future Congresses. We had no way to bind the States. This is not a contract; it is an act, the unilateral act of Congress. I have never contended what the Senator has stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Congress did intend, to some extent at least, to influence future Congresses and States in the future because it said, by doing this we want to make clear that what we do in this instance in extending State law out here will not serve as a basis for a State making a further claim. However, that language never was intended to preclude a State from asserting then or in the future an appeal for equity in the State, whose people were producing the wealth we are discussing here.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to conclude this part of the matter by saying that what Congress tried to do in 1953 with respect to the Outer Continental Shelf was to make very clear—as clear as we could—that the mineral resources of the outer shelf lands were Federal property in every sense of the term.

However, we felt, in order to have proper administration of the shelf, that where there was no Federal law that was applicable in a particular situation the law of the adjoining State should be applicable. The Congress had in mind the fact that previous bills had been introduced in Congress which would have given to the States not only lands within the 3-mile limit or historic boundary, but lands many, many miles beyond State boundaries. In some instances, State claims went out 27 miles, and in others to the outer edge of the outer shelf.

So Congress wanted to make clear that nothing in the Outer Continental Shelf Act was to be construed as a basis for further claim to the land beyond that contained in the first so-called tidelands bill we had passed; that is, the Submerged Lands Act.

I think the point here is a legal point. The Congress has no authority to bind

the States. Clearly, one Congress can change any law that another Congress has passed. The only thing we cannot change is the Constitution. That has to be done in accordance with the Constitution itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think there has been some minor misconception about what transpired in 1953. Inasmuch as the Senator from Florida had a considerable part in developing both of the laws passed, particularly the Submerged Lands Act, and also a considerable part in the Continental Shelf Act, perhaps I can make statements which would be clarifying.

First, I think the Senator from Washington is in error—not great error, but error—in stating that the Federal Government "gave" to the various States the lands within their territorial limits extending generally 3 maritime miles, but as to some States 3 maritime leagues.

What happened was that the Federal Government in effect quitclaimed those areas to the States.

Mr. JACKSON. What was the consideration?

Mr. HOLLAND. There had never been a claim by the Federal courts that the Federal Government owned those lands. The three Supreme Court cases controlling, which were the California case, the Texas case, and the Louisiana case, all held that the Federal Government had a "paramount interest," whatever that meant, but they carefully shied away from saying the Federal Government owned the beds of the sea out to the limits of the States. They said the Federal Government had a "paramount interest," and the States came back and asked for quitclaims of that paramount interest, not a gift of the lands, because the lands were not held, even by Supreme Court decisions, to be the property of the Federal Government.

The reason I bring up that point is that the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case had made it very clear that if the rules of laches, estoppel, and the statute of limitations had applied against the Federal Government, the court's ruling could not be as was the majority holding in the California case.

They all recognized the fact there had been a long course of dealings, over a hundred years, under which the Federal Government had, in the course of many instances, recognized State title in those lands. Senators will find that in the opinion, and particularly the opinion in the California case, it was freely stated that if the laws of laches, estoppel, and the statute of limitations had applied against the Federal Government, as they would apply against an ordinary individual, there would be no question of the right of the States to maintain their own paramount interest and title in the submerged lands. So the purpose of the Submerged Lands Act was to, in effect, quitclaim back to the States that strip of land so as to—if one can say this in so many words—admit that the Federal Government should have been subject to the rules of laches, estoppel, and the statute of limitations, and that the long

established rule of dealings between the Federal Government and the State government would be recognized; and that that strip of land would be quitclaimed back to the States. The word "quitclaim" appears several times in the debate on the Submerged Lands Act, and I think in the act itself.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. I think we are dealing in legalisms.

When I say "own," a person does not really own his real property. Let us go back to law school for a moment. We were all taught in real property that what one has is an "interest in land." There are varying degrees of interest in land. The highest form of interest one can have is a title in fee simple. However, in accordance with the common law doctrine, ownership descends from the Crown, or Sovereign.

I think what we are saying here is that the Federal Government, in asserting a paramount interest, for all practical purposes—let us face it—had title in fee simple.

Mr. HOLLAND. No, no.

Mr. JACKSON. Well, let us just be practical. Was there any dispute at the time that the oil—and this is what we are really talking about—in the tidelands, under the Supreme Court decisions, would not be available to the States?

Mr. HOLLAND. None at all, because that was not the principal thing at issue in the decision.

Mr. JACKSON. That is right.

Mr. HOLLAND. But it was the values other than the oil, as regards 19 of the 22 maritime States, that we were particularly concerned about. We were disturbed about the right to use for fill purposes, for the building of piers, and for the disposal of waste, and so forth, those areas in which we have so much frontage that cannot be used or developed without those uses. But so much only for that point, because I am not going to argue it in any great detail. It was not a gift of fee simple title. It was a quitclaim of the interest that was first acquired by the Federal Government under the three decisions, and which the Federal courts carefully refrained from saying was a title of property rights but was of "paramount interest," whatever that means.

Now, the second point—

Mr. JACKSON. Will the Senator let me finish this point, because it is very important? Is it not fair to say, then, that the title conveyed was less than fee simple?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was less than fee simple.

Mr. JACKSON. But if we were only concerned about the right of fill in certain areas of the tidelands, and that was all that was at stake, why did we not exempt the oil properties? This fight was over the oil lands which was a very valuable interest in land. That is my point. As the Senator knows, I voted against the conveyance to the States of this valuable Federal property.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fight, so far as I am concerned, was not on the oil feature, but more largely on others, because we have several hundred keys or islands which could not be developed—very valuable tracts of little, odd shaped, and sometimes very small lands, most of which could not be developed without the right of recourse to both the Straits of Florida or the Atlantic on one side, and the Gulf of Mexico on the other, to the extent of use to a regular line and to fill and to use the areas of salt water for the building of piers.

The Senator will remember that we even had many instances wherein the law had been so well regarded that bond attorneys had passed upon the right of municipalities and other public units to build and develop piers, and so forth—as for instance, in Atlantic City, out into the Atlantic Ocean, and to give a mortgage upon the bottoms and the structure that was upon the bottoms. I am not wanting to argue the matter overall, but I want to make it clear that the Senator from Louisiana has a point, that it was not an outright gift, but was a quitclaim and was so stated many times in the act or on this floor, and was to have settled the disturbing question.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Washington, because I made some study of it at the time, that we discovered about 100 instances in the history of the Nation, prior to that time, in which the Federal Government, through its appropriate officers, had asked the States for the right to use certain of the bottoms for certain Federal purposes and had been granted that right—some of them when I was Governor of Florida.

So that there was a course of dealing there, under which, if both units had been private parties there would not have been the slightest question about the fact that title to that strip of land that constituted submerged lands would have belonged to the States, but it was a quitclaim deed. Now, let me get to another point—

Mr. JACKSON. Would the Senator please let me finish this one point? That bill as passed, in providing for a quitclaim on the property in question, involved conveyance to the States of valuable property—of a valuable property interest.

Mr. HOLLAND. The bill as passed involved the yielding of the Federal Government of any right, title, and interest it had under the term "paramount interest," which was all that it had ever had or ever claimed had been given it under the three decisions of the Supreme Court.

Mr. JACKSON. Was the property being conveyed by the statute of value?

Mr. HOLLAND. In most cases, it was.

Mr. JACKSON. And very substantial value.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as Florida is concerned, there was never any oil involved in better than 1,100 miles of that frontage; and yet the most valuable property we have in our State is the gulf front, the ocean front, and the Straits of Florida property to develop the properties, particularly if they grew to city size.

To get to my second point, shortly prior to the passage of the bills, at a convention held by the nations of the world, it had been agreed by more than a two-thirds vote, which is the vote required in order to set up international law, that all nations should have the right to develop and use the property values that might be discovered, utilized, and developed in the bottoms of the sea adjoining them out to the Continental Shelf.

Thus, there are two problems involved. One was to balance the books between the Federal Government and the State governments, which had arisen from the three decisions of the Supreme Court. The other—and the Senator from Florida stoutly, throughout this whole discussion, insisted that this should be and must be a Federal problem—to provide machinery through which the Federal Government could develop those property values in the Outer Continental Shelf, whatever they might be. It was predominantly an oil and possibly a gas and sulfur development that was hoped for and has been realized since, at least as to the oil and sulfur development—I am not familiar with what has been done with reference to gas.

The reason for that was to set up machinery under which the Federal Government, under the action taken by the convention of the maritime nations of the world, had the right to develop and claim for itself or its contracting parties all valuation that could be developed from the low water mark out to the Continental Shelf. The Senator from Florida supported that act, just as he supported the other. But there was another point, a third point, that came up, and that was: By what law shall this outer shelf be governed? The convention of the nations left much to be desired on that point.

So Congress decided, and the law contains the provision that we all have been talking about, that the law of the State which abuts the property out to the Continental Shelf shall be regarded the law for all purposes not covered by Federal acts. That covers a great many things, because, of course, people were to work there. There were to be wage and hour provisions. People were to develop lands under contracts with the Federal Government. In many instances, they became sublessees and maybe sublessees of sublessees, to develop. The question of the interpretation of contracts came into consideration as a very important part of the whole picture.

There were, for instance, questions of employment compensation. Many, many questions which arise in the course of an important employment and an important development, such as was planned and has taken place, had to be considered. And the process has only begun. My own feeling is, as the Senator from Louisiana has suggested, that many other uses of the ocean bottom, the bottom of the Gulf of Mexico, and the bottom of the Gulf of Alaska will be found. I think that in the Gulf of Alaska we shall have probably as great development as anywhere else in our Nation, perhaps greater.

So Congress decided, and I think wisely, to extend the State law, without

the extension of State territorial jurisdiction, out to the Continental Shelf in the areas we are talking about.

Many questions discussed in the debate were left open by the decision. Everyone knew that the people who would work out there would have children who would go to school. Everyone knew that there would be needs for hospitalization and that they would be taken care of, in the main, in the hospitals of the State which abutted the area. Everyone knew that in the course of everyday working life and the living of families together, where the families would be on the mainland and the workers would work in the areas where the development was taking place, there would be a tremendous number of human relations. So those problems were not finally dealt with, and we had no success in trying to deal with them.

I remember perfectly well that some States claimed the entire right. I remember that a certain State—the State of Texas—wanted the full right out to the Continental Shelf, which in some locations, as I remember, went out about 125 miles. If it had been my own State, and I had made the same claim, the distance would have extended 150 miles into the gulf, off the west coast of Florida, which would patently be ridiculous.

But the questions were difficult, and the answers to some of them were entirely unknown. I have mentioned the Gulf of Alaska. That region came up repeatedly in the course of the debate. No one knew what would be discovered out there. Everyone hoped that there would be great discoveries and great development out in those waters, which, in the main, are shallow waters.

So that question was left. I would not want anyone to think that there was any attempt, in the drafting of the Continental Shelf Act, to do other than what I indicated in the beginning—set up the machinery for the development of whatever resources could be developed out there, with the Federal Government as the landlord or the owner from the standpoint of having the right to develop under the international agreement that had been reached, and whoever contracted with the Federal Government being the one who was given the privilege of development.

That was what was sought to be done, together with the setting up of the law of the State abutting the particular area, as the governing law, so the daily relations of the people who were going to work by the hundreds, and by the thousands, it has proven, in those areas would not be without law or a body of law to cover their relations, but, instead, would be governed by the laws of the abutting States.

Mr. President, it sounds very complex, but it was not complex at all. It was a quite simple adaptation of the plan to have machinery given to develop values in the ocean bed, out to the Continental Shelf, governed and controlled by contracts which gave the right to develop, and by law which governed the activities and actions of the people who were out there working. That is all it amounts to.

It could not be claimed at all—and I notice with approval the Senator from Washington has not claimed—that there

was anything in this act which precluded any of the maritime States from laying claim to the values out there. That was not the point that was decided at all. My feeling is that to bring that into the picture here would be completely in defeat of what was intended by the passage of the act, which was to leave, first, to subsequent discoveries as to what was there and what could be produced—and nobody knew at that time definitely what could be produced—and, second, what would be a fair method of dealing with that production. Congress had not spoken on that at all.

I apologize for taking this much time, but I believe I have correctly set forth what was involved in the two acts. Senators will remember that the Supreme Court has passed on them since that time, and has passed several times on the Tidelands Act or the Submerged Lands Act, and has made clear what was involved there, and has passed on the other act enough to make clear the purpose; but that there was nothing to preclude the States setting up such claims as the States felt they had in the outside areas.

I do not think we know what can be done in the outside areas well enough yet to have fixed, binding rules to be applied to all the 22 maritime States. I think we are going to have legislation on that eventually. I do not think this is the act in which that should be attempted.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I find I was slightly in error, and that the distinguished senior Senator from Florida was slightly in error, when we talked about the quitclaiming of the tidelands. The Submerged Lands Act which conveyed to the States the Federal interest in the lands in issue asserts: "The United States releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons the aforesaid," and so forth.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the word "quitclaim" the Senator will find throughout the course of the discussion, and I think in the act itself. The point is that it was never claimed that the United States was able to give or did give fee simple title.

Mr. JACKSON. One can assert that the words "releases and relinquishes" is equivalent to quitclaiming. In order that the record may be accurate, I wanted to cite the statutory language. I find I was in error. I take it that my friend and colleague from Florida agrees the statutory language does not include the word "quitclaim."

Mr. HOLLAND. I would have to look at the statute again, but I think I spoke several volumes, myself, in the course of the debate. My recollection is it lasted about 7 weeks. I know we spent a great many days and nights in giving final form to these several acts in the subcommittee in which, although the Senator from Florida was not a member of the standing controlling committee, he was given a chance to participate. I know what we were talking about all the time was that the Federal Government was going to go out of the way to give to the States whatever was meant by paramount right, and let the States go

ahead, within their own boundaries and what since the beginning of our country had always been considered as theirs.

Mr. JACKSON. What I was trying to point out was that the Federal Government was giving up whatever interest the Supreme Court had ruled the Federal Government had in the area in question. The Federal Government gave that up in legislation approved by the Congress. The Supreme Court subsequently made that clear.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Supreme Court referred in those three cases to what it called paramount right. It did not use the language "proprietary interest" or anything like that. It said "paramount right." Much better scholars of the law than the Senator from Florida, from all over the Nation, particularly in the maritime States, were scratching their heads from one end of the Nation to the other trying to ascertain what "paramount right" meant. There were as many interpretations as there were lawyers, but nobody claimed it was to give the proprietary interest or fee simple title.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me we should understand this, so it can be laid to rest. Subsection (3) of the act reads:

The provisions of this section for adoption of State law as the law of the United States shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction * * * of the Outer Continental Shelf * * * or the revenues therefrom.

Now, the key phrase to which I would draw the Senator's attention is the words preceding the word "shall," which are "the provisions of this section for adoption of State law as the law of the United States," making it very clear that this section merely says that the fact that the State law is extended to apply in this area shall not be the basis for a State claiming any interest in it, but there is nothing whatever in that section to be construed to say that the fact that the submerged lands adjoin the State, and that the State has some interest in the matter, might not serve as a basis for the State claiming either some revenue or some interest in, or requesting that it be assigned some interest in, something on the Outer Continental Shelf. It is only that this particular provision was not intended to serve as a basis for the assertion of a State claim.

If we could understand that, then it seems to me that we would have the basis to go forward on this point, because this provision was not put in here, on any basis whatever, as an attempt to preclude a State from asking for equity, from asking for justice, from asking for a share of revenues, or from asserting any other claim.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Congress has no authority to do such a thing. We could not if we wanted to. I have never made such a contention. I think I have tried to make it clear that Congress has no such authority.

I suppose we could submit to the States a constitutional amendment, in accordance with the Constitution, to provide

for such a restriction on State action. But otherwise, absent such a constitutional amendment, obviously we have no such authority.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; but the point I wanted to make clear is that when a State comes in and says, "We think we have a greater interest in this matter than somebody else; the Federal Government claims it and has rights to it under international law, paramount rights over others because its boundaries adjoin it; we, the State, say that our boundary also joins it, just as the Federal boundary does, and therefore, we have an interest in the matter."

There was nothing in that section intended to assert that a State could not claim, assert, or request some interest in connection with the matter.

Not long ago the Federal Government suggested that it would like to pay to the State of Louisiana some money to help the State implement its conservation practices in the area with regard to the amount of oil produced in those wells out there, when the State was having difficulty administering the allowances of the offshore wells. That is an example of some revenue being paid to the State, not because this provision is applicable, but just because the State was having difficulty providing as good a program, because of shortage of funds to do the job, as it would like to have provided.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Outer Continental Shelf Act as approved by the 83d Congress, had many provisions. One provision was to make clear in the legislation that the adjoining States had no authority to lay claim to anything out there by reason of another provision in the law dealing with limited State jurisdiction. That is the whole point. The provision does not mean, and did not mean at that time, that Congress could not come along later and give to the States adjoining the Outer Continental Shelf whatever it wanted to give them out there. Congress always retains that right with respect to Federal property.

But Congress, in 1953, in dealing with the Outer Continental Shelf legislation, was greatly concerned lest provisions within the proposed legislation—the Outer Continental Shelf Act—might be interpreted or construed to give to the adjoining States something which Congress made very clear it was not doing in that act.

In the Senate, the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor, and the acting chairman of the Interior Committee, was the distinguished then senior Senator from Oregon, Senator Guy Cordon. There was pending an amendment to provide for reimbursement of the coastal States from the Outer Continental Shelf revenues.

I read now from page 240 of the hearings on the pending bill, at the bottom of the page, quoting a statement of former Senator Guy Cordon at the time he was in charge of the bill. This is what he said:

The propounding of this amendment [reimbursement of coastal states from OCS revenues] is simply Chapter III in the attempt of the States along the gulf to get some

portion of the receipts from the areas outside their boundaries. Call them reimbursements; call them local taxes or call them severance taxes, or what have you; what is desired is some portion of the receipts from Federal resources in the area outside those States.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, if I did not stand on my feet and oppose this amendment, I would feel I was guilty of bad faith to the United States Senate. I do not believe there is a Senator who did not understand, when we passed the submerged lands bill, that we were excluding from its operation any interest on the part of those States in any area outside their boundaries. I intend to stand unequivocally upon that principle as it was enunciated here, at least by the acting chairman of the committee, when the submerged lands bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13 was before the Senate.

Mr. President, that statement of Senator Cordon, I think, should lay to rest any question as to what Congress intended back in 1953, when we approved the Outer Continental Shelf legislation.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I think the discussions we have had on the effect of the Outer Continental Shelf Act and the so-called submerged lands or Tidelands Act has been quite enlightening, and certainly interesting, as shown by the fact that we have been discussing it for an hour or more; but I really do not see the relevancy of discussing the technicalities of those acts and what was intended, because we have under discussion here a bill to assign funds derived from oil and gas production on the Outer Continental Shelf to a fund to be used for the purchase of recreation lands; and the immediate amendment before us is not to assign or earmark funds for this special purpose, but to take the necessary funds from the general revenues of the Treasury.

As has been pointed out in the course of the discussion, there is litigation now pending between the State of Louisiana and the U.S. Government to determine the legality of the retention of these funds by the United States, or whether they should belong to the State of Louisiana on a royalty basis. The bill provides that none of the funds involved in litigation would be touched, anyway; they would be held in escrow.

So it seems to me that we ought to be discussing here the merits of the bill, to determine whether or not the funds that do come into the ownership and possession of the United States should go into this fund and be dedicated to this purpose, when appropriation is made by the committees of Congress, for the purchase of recreation lands for land and water conservation in various States from the funds that are not being used.

Mr. President, I rise today to add my support for what I consider one of the most important pieces of legislation to come up this session, S. 1401, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965. As a cosponsor of the original act, I am vitally concerned that the amendments to increase the amount of money available to the fund be passed so that America can begin to erase the

backlog of acquiring and developing urgently needed outdoor recreation areas.

I remind the Senate that we helped to initiate the broad program to provide the Nation with outdoor recreation space sufficient to the needs of this and future generations. In 1958, Congress created the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It was headed by Laurence Rockefeller, and its membership consisted of distinguished members from inside and outside of Congress. Using interviews with thousands of Americans, it inventoried the Nation's outdoor resources and projected recreation demand to the year 2000.

In 1962, the Commission released its report, Outdoor Recreation for America, containing its findings and 50 recommendations for action. Almost everything said about outdoor recreation in America since has drawn on that report. Congress has carried out many of the recommendations, including the establishment of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and programs to provide assistance to the States. Today, outdoor recreation is a going program in which every level of government is involved. The purpose of S. 1401 is to keep it a going program.

A few of the treasures Congress has added to the Nation's outdoor recreation resources since the ORRRC's report are Point Reyes National Seashore, Padre Island National Seashore, Canyonlands National Park, Delaware Watergap National Recreation Area, Assateague Island, and Cape Cod National Seashore. A Senate-passed bill to create a Redwoods National Park is now before the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

To raise money for the purchase of these park and recreation lands, and for the support of Federal and State outdoor recreation programs, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was passed.

Experience has now made it clear that the revenues we provided for the fund are inadequate. This is because the fees established for the use of Federal areas have failed to raise the estimated amounts. Almost \$25 million a year less is coming into the fund than was expected. We cannot simply wait for the fund to build up because land prices always escalate in areas suitable for public parks and recreation areas. Early in 1967 President Johnson pointed out that average land prices are increasing at a rate of almost 10 percent a year and that the cost of land for recreation is increasing at a considerably higher rate. He stated that the most effective means of controlling these increases is to acquire the lands as quickly as possible after areas are authorized by Congress. We in the Interior Committee have been made fully aware of this problem and of the great difficulty the National Park Service and other agencies have had in trying to overcome it.

Today's fund is not sufficient to keep up with purchases of areas already authorized by Congress, let alone to finance additions.

If the Federal Government and the States are forced to wait until the moneys now going into the land and water conservation fund are sufficient, the ultimate cost to the taxpayers will be very great. It will save millions of dollars in the

years ahead if we invest in these needed lands as soon as possible. This problem has received a great deal of study, by private organizations devoted to conservation, by the executive branch, and by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It is our considered judgment that the most practical solution is to raise the moneys from the sources proposed in this bill.

Besides adding revenues to the fund, S. 1401 would give the land management agencies administrative weapons to fight rising land prices. One of these would permit department heads, under certain conditions, to secure options for the land authorized for parks or recreation areas prior to actual appropriation of moneys from the land and water conservation fund. Another would set up a lease-back and sell-back land management program for property bought for the national park system. Amounts obtained from lease-back and sell-back transactions would be credited to the fund, thus lessening the burden imposed by the initial purchase of property.

Mr. President, the Federal portion of the land and water conservation fund is the primary financing source for all new acquisitions by the National Park Service and the Forest Service as well as for expansion of existing facilities. It is the financial base for expanding recreation programs of the States and their political subdivisions. Only added revenues will make it possible for these agencies to meet the park and recreation requirements of our citizens in the next decade. I support prompt approval of this bill.

Mr. President, so far as the funds now coming into the U.S. Treasury from the Continental Shelf are concerned, it is entirely logical that an amount be provided in the fund of up to \$200 million a year for the next 3 years up to \$300 million a year for the remaining 2 years so that we could know in advance that we could appropriate money up to that amount and that the funds would be there without being a drain against the general revenues that we are worried about.

There would be that much money provided for the making of appropriations. However, the final process of dividing the money always remains with Congress, and the money must be appropriated first by action of the Appropriations Committees and then by action of the full body of the House and the Senate.

We are not derogating from the appropriation process. We are simply trying to provide a wider planning base with which to go ahead with the acquisition of these properties.

As the chairman of the committee indicated in his discussion on the pending bill, we have many times been disappointed in having set aside areas for a national recreation area or park and having estimated the cost of acquisition at the time of the original authorization and then discovered, before we could get the appropriations process completed, that the land price had escalated double or even more.

I think that the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]

cited Point Reyes as an example in which the escalation of price had gone from \$14 million to something like \$47 million during the time in which we have been trying to get the appropriations process completed.

If the funds were in the land and water conservation fund, the appropriation process could be more quickly implemented and we could avoid these great escalations in price.

I think this is of the greatest importance, because what we do in this area of outdoor recreation now will be of benefit to our descendants for generations without end. If we do not move now and the lands are not later available to us, they will be lost forever and will not be made available to future generations of Americans.

I think the best way to assure that we can make reasonable progress is to agree to the pending amendment which would provide that this extra revenue would come to the Federal Government from the Outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that I certainly would be happy to support an authorization to provide the amount of money proposed in this bill for development of these areas; and, if it can be justified, I certainly would be willing to vote for any appropriation for any year. It is a worthy cause, and I would be happy to vote for it.

However, does the Senator really believe that it is essential that the revenues of the Outer Continental Shelf be devoted to this purpose, even though that might mean that excluded from the Outer Continental Shelf would be funds necessary to develop the Outer Continental Shelf itself or to control pollution in the area, with the result that what is left eventually becomes a cesspool, although it started out as something of considerable value?

In other words, if one realizes that this is not a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, which someone can get at no expense, but is a revenue to the Federal Government on which all programs could make a claim, as it is at the present time, why should there be the dedication of the revenues that can be produced on the Outer Continental Shelf rather than simply providing an authorization and appropriations for whatever amounts can be justified for the program?

Mr. MOSS. The reason for turning to this source of revenue is one of logical connection between the exploitation of a resource out there, from which there is income, to acquiring capital resources for the entire country elsewhere, where we need recreation areas. This does not exclude coastal areas that might be adjacent to the Continental Shelf area where the fund is coming from, and it might even extend far enough out to include some of the Continental Shelf. This is a national resource, and it would be used for national purposes. It will be used not only to buy property for the Federal Government to administer, but also, it is prorated out to the States on a

regular formula, for them to use also in buying recreational lands. It goes not only to the State but also to the subdivisions of the State.

So this is a calculated program to acquire recreational resources, and we are using the revenues from some of our other tangible resources in so doing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If there is to be a dedication, it would seem to me that if the revenue is taken from the natural resources, first priority should be to build some value in the area that is being depleted.

When one is depleting the Outer Continental Shelf and polluting it considerably in doing so, it would seem to me that the first claim, if one desires to dedicate those resources, would be to build a fisheries potential. I am told that it is possible to develop a program of farming the sea that would yield a hundred times as much edible food—in terms of fish, shrimp, and other marine life—as we are producing in the sea at the present time.

That is a way in which one could build some value in this area, so that the people who are producing this oil could continue to have jobs, to help themselves and all humanity, after all the oil is gone 40 or 50 years from now.

To dedicate what these people can produce here to a recreation program somewhere else is somewhat parallel to what happened in West Virginia, where the mining practices were such that producers destroyed the future value of that land, or what happened in my State, where the forestry practices were such that they denuded the land, destroyed all the small trees, and left the place in such shape that nothing was left from which someone could earn a living in the future.

As between the land resources and the water resources of the United States, would not one have a difficult time showing that the water resources had been managed as well as the land resources? The land resources at least have been replanted, they are being developed, they are being used constructively, while our water resources are so badly polluted that some of the Great Lakes are nothing but cesspools. The pollution is spreading and becoming worse, with a \$50 billion backlog of work that must be done at this time, and no adequate provision is made for doing it.

So, as between taking from one area and one source of revenue to provide for another, it appears to me that if one takes the money from the Outer Continental Shelf, which has a great potential, and the sea, which has a great potential to produce for all mankind for the future—and which desperately needs money to develop those resources, although those resources are being injured by pollution and by improper usage—and uses that money to develop land resources, it really is a matter of taxing the poor to help the rich.

One can find good use for the parks and for the recreation areas, and those of us who are concerned about developing the potential of the sea and of the Outer Continental Shelf would be happy to support any appropriation that could be justified to develop and improve the

park and recreation areas, as well as the other purposes of the bill.

I ask the Senator, would it not be satisfactory to him, and to those who agree with him, to settle for simply the amount of money they need, without dedicating the resources of an area, which itself needs to be developed, to this park program?

Mr. MOSS. Let me say to the Senator that I certainly agree that there should be control of any pollution that is coming into the Continental Shelf area or elsewhere along the coastline as a result of producing oil and gas or other minerals from the bed beneath the sea. I would agree that we should use revenues,

if it is the job of the Federal Government to do so.

I would expect, however, that the Federal Government, as the proprietor, the one who issues the lease or permit to the producer, should require of him that he not pollute the area and require him to take whatever steps are needed to correct any pollution that is taking place there. In that respect, I believe we should move with all vigor.

But I do not believe that this at all changes the situation of using some of the revenues that are coming into the Federal Treasury as a result of the production of oil and gas out there for the land and water conservation fund, and

there be available for appropriation by Congress for land and water purposes, which are recreation purposes.

I believe that the bill that has been worked out by the committee—it has unanimous support of the Federal departments involved—is a giant step forward, and we should take it.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain tables and excerpts in connection with my remarks on the floor be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF RECEIPTS

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

[Fiscal year 1955 through 1967. Updated through Jan. 31, 1968]

	Bonuses, rents 141820	Royalties 142020	Escrow	Total		Bonuses, rents 141820	Royalties 142020	Escrow	Total
1955	\$142,404,630.48	0	\$12,217,134.37	\$154,621,764.85	1963	\$359,370,525.43	\$7,443,921.55	(\$229,540,465.57)	\$137,273,981.41
1956	111,171,041.53	\$52,814.63	26,518,518.78	137,742,374.94	1964	5,870,970.00	10,620,439.52	135,904,544.80	152,395,954.32
	(57,434,228.69)	1 (1,656.94)	57,435,885.63		1965	42,223,700.64	11,246,201.92	89,032,099.84	142,502,002.40
1957	1,976,361.00	232,342.31	10,969,890.58	13,178,593.89	1966	161,893,155.47	86,424,061.11	(39,552,372.76)	208,764,843.82
1958	2,630,090.41	830,760.69	12,208,496.48	15,669,347.58	1967	596,202,951.97	41,107,770.26	148,129,983.44	785,440,705.67
1959	1,145,720.00	2,266,484.40	20,418,121.35	23,830,325.75	Through Jan- uary 31, 1968	204,629,546.95	30,372,670.78	69,539,020.62	304,541,238.35
1960	226,616,838.22	2,839,980.97	172,262,367.50	401,722,186.69	Total	1,807,807,657.66	204,629,546.95	1,027,895,388.18	3,038,949,320.77
1961	1,716,161.23	5,588,525.60	43,762,875.15	51,067,561.98					
1962	6,006,921.00	5,605,230.15	498,586,287.97	510,198,439.12					

¹ GAO adjustment taken from general fund and placed in escrow.

Note: Does not include California sale of February 6, 1968, of \$602,719,261.60 bonus and 1st year rental of \$1,089,543.

STATE PARTICIPATION IN LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

STATUS OF STATE OBLIGATIONS BASED ON 75 PERCENT ACCRUAL OF FISCAL YEAR 1968 APPORTIONMENT

State	Apportionment based on final fiscal year 1965, 1966, 1967, 75 per- cent accrual of fiscal year 1968	Obligations ¹ As of March 30, 1968	Percent of apportion- ment	Balance	State	Apportionment based on final fiscal year 1965, 1966, 1967, 75 per- cent accrual of fiscal year 1968	Obligations ¹ As of March 30, 1968	Percent of apportion- ment	Balance
Alabama	\$3,238,448	\$2,056,294	63.0	\$1,182,154	New Mexico	\$2,395,499	\$2,387,899	99.6	\$7,600
Alaska	1,807,037	1,739,237	96.0	67,800	New York	11,807,386	10,551,159	89.0	1,256,227
Arizona	2,533,849	1,949,655	77.0	584,194	North Carolina	3,571,499	2,562,728	72.0	1,008,771
Arkansas	2,434,967	1,821,599	75.0	613,368	North Dakota	2,061,788	1,922,552	93.0	139,236
California	10,498,130	9,667,659	92.0	830,471	Ohio	6,778,177	5,380,661	79.0	1,397,516
Colorado	2,692,426	2,475,316	92.0	217,110	Oklahoma	2,814,890	1,793,714	64.0	1,021,176
Connecticut	3,247,921	2,074,102	64.0	1,173,819	Oregon	2,807,487	2,256,673	80.0	550,814
Delaware	1,861,935	1,760,768	95.0	101,167	Pennsylvania	7,695,501	4,099,255	53.0	3,596,246
Florida	4,701,449	4,619,546	98.0	81,903	Rhode Island	2,188,400	1,997,439	91.0	190,961
Georgia	3,482,950	2,674,865	77.0	808,085	South Carolina	2,755,258	1,353,961	49.0	1,401,297
Hawaii	2,203,496	2,060,692	94.0	142,804	South Dakota	2,339,448	1,946,796	83.0	392,652
Idaho	1,977,451	1,471,146	74.0	506,305	Tennessee	3,281,348	1,164,366	35.0	2,116,982
Illinois	7,422,379	4,542,198	61.0	2,880,181	Texas	7,552,985	5,686,944	75.0	1,866,041
Indiana	4,199,946	2,097,231	50.0	2,102,715	Utah	2,213,464	1,930,107	87.0	283,357
Iowa	3,341,931	2,108,010	63.0	1,233,921	Vermont	2,268,003	1,691,491	75.0	576,512
Kansas	2,818,831	2,543,047	90.0	275,784	Virginia	3,545,597	2,972,544	84.0	573,053
Kentucky	3,502,469	2,249,706	64.0	1,252,763	Washington	3,144,894	2,826,598	90.0	318,296
Louisiana	3,459,862	3,203,597	93.0	256,265	West Virginia	2,552,425	1,087,353	43.0	1,465,072
Maine	2,206,651	1,769,862	80.0	436,789	Wisconsin	3,926,005	3,509,135	89.0	416,870
Maryland	4,021,138	3,271,206	81.0	749,932	Wyoming	1,977,857	1,684,518	85.0	293,339
Massachusetts	4,471,888	255,876	6.0	4,216,012	District of Columbia	1,063,932	958,918	90.0	105,014
Michigan	6,377,206	4,736,742	74.0	1,640,464	Puerto Rico	1,716,227	1,297,631	76.0	418,596
Minnesota	3,593,460	2,027,491	56.0	1,565,969	Virgin Islands	274,260	35,786	13.0	238,474
Mississippi	2,517,639	1,486,430	59.0	1,031,209	Guam	294,422	188,263	64.0	106,159
Missouri	4,425,700	4,550,881	103.0	(125,181)	American Samoa	266,707	121,299	66.0	145,408
Montana	2,263,095	1,477,988	65.0	785,107					
Nebraska	2,516,551	2,234,964	89.0	281,587	Subtotal	188,472,819	142,483,616		45,989,203
Nevada	1,893,694	1,639,732	87.0	253,962	Contingency	9,591,988	7,811,757		1,780,231
New Hampshire	2,135,805	1,792,199	84.0	343,606	Total	198,064,807	150,295,373		47,769,434
New Jersey	5,331,056	4,717,787	88.0	613,269					

¹ Contingency not included.

Note: Missouri is the only State that is overobligated.

[From p. 237 of the Senate Interior Committee hearings on S. 1401 and related bills, Feb. 5, 6, and 21, 1956]

PRECEDENTS FOR EARMARKING SOURCES OF REVENUE FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES

The method provided in H.R. 3846 (the bill on which the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act was adopted in the 88th Congress) of setting aside certain revenues from particular sources is neither unprecedented

nor novel in any way. Set forth below are a few of the examples of similar legislation, some of it of long standing, for generally allied purposes.

1. *Highway trust fund.*—The fund is obtained from excise taxes (on gasoline, diesel fuel, trucks, buses, tires, etc.); such revenues being earmarked and set aside in the trust fund to meet expenditures for Federal-aid highways (Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374)).

2. *Forest road fund.*—Ten percent of the annual revenues from the national forest activities is earmarked and available under the permanent appropriation roads and trails for States, for construction and maintenance in the particular State from which such proceeds are derived (16 U.S.C. 501).

3. *Pittman-Robertson Act.*—Eleven percent of the excise tax on the manufacture of firearms and ammunition is earmarked for purposes of the act. Such fund is used to

reimburse States a share of the costs of wildlife restoration projects and related matters (16 U.S.C. 669).

4. *Dingell-Johnson Act*.—Earmarks 10 percent of the excise tax on sport-fishing tackle; such funds being used to assist States in connection with fish restoration and management projects (16 U.S.C. 777a-k).

5. *Pribilof Islands fund*.—Receipts of sale from sealskins and other wildlife products of Pribilof Islands are earmarked and made available for administration of the islands (72 Stat. 339).

6. *Yellowstone school fund*.—A portion of

the revenues received from visitors to Yellowstone National Park are earmarked for use in providing for school facilities (62 Stat. 338).

7. *Reclamation fund*.—Repayment and other revenues from irrigation and power facilities, certain receipts of sales, and rentals of Federal lands in 17 Western States are earmarked and made available for expenditures for purposes of the act (43 U.S.C. 391).

The foregoing relate to the earmarking of receipts for various Federal programs. In addition, there is considerable earmarking of receipts going directly to States, as shown

on pages 478 and 479 of the budget of the United States, 1965.

The CHAIRMAN. This list is only a partial one: The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 earmarks 90 percent of its revenues. Then there is, I believe, an earmarking in the legislation pertaining to sugar.

Also in this connection, I would like to call attention to the fact that S. 1401 provides for such earmarking for a definitely limited period of time; namely, only 5 years. After that, absent new legislation, the income would go into the Federal Treasury again.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS (PERMANENT, INDEFINITE, SPECIAL FUNDS UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED)

PROGRAM AND FINANCING (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

[From the appendix to the budget for fiscal year 1965, pp. 478-479]

	1963 actual	1964 estimate	1965 estimate		1963 actual	1964 estimate	1965 estimate
Program by activities:				New obligatory authority:			
1. Expenses, sale of timber, etc., on reclamation lands.....		2	2	Expenses, sale of timber, etc., on reclamation lands.....		2	2
2. Leasing of grazing lands.....		1	1	Leasing of grazing lands (receipt limitation) (general fund).....		1	1
3. Payments to Oklahoma (royalties).....	6	6	10	Payments to Oklahoma (royalties) (receipt limitation) (general fund).....	6	6	10
4. Payments to Coos and Douglas Counties, Oreg., from receipts, Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands.....	694	985	750	Payments to Coos and Douglas Counties, Oreg. from receipts, Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands.....	691	975	750
5. Payments to counties, Oregon and California grant lands.....	15,400	15,031	18,000	Payments to counties, Oregon and California grant lands.....	15,400	15,031	18,000
6. Payments to States (grazing fees).....		1	1	Payments to States (grazing fees).....	1	1	1
7. Payments to States (proceeds of sales).....	249	230	232	Payments to States (proceeds of sales) (receipt limitation) (general fund).....	249	230	232
8. Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands outside grazing districts.....	187	335	350	Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands outside grazing districts.....	187	335	350
9. Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands within grazing districts.....	202	304	324	Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands within grazing districts.....	202	304	324
10. Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands within grazing districts, miscellaneous.....	4	10	10	Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands within grazing districts, miscellaneous.....	4	10	10
11. Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act.....	47,148	47,650	49,301	Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act.....	47,148	47,650	49,301
12. Payments to counties, national grasslands.....	92	208	211	Payments to counties, national grasslands.....	92	208	211
13. Expenses, Public Land Administration Act.....	486	1,214	960	Expenses, Public Land Administration Act.....	746	800	800
Total program costs funded.....	64,469	65,978	70,152	Appropriation.....	64,727	65,553	69,992
Change in selected resources ¹	-15						
Total obligations.....	64,454	65,978	70,152				
Financing:							
Unobligated balance brought forward.....	-497	-769	-345				
Unobligated balance carried forward.....	769	345	185				
New obligatory authority.....	64,727	65,553	69,992				

¹ Selected resources as of June 30 are as follows: Unpaid undelivered orders, 1962, \$228,000; 1963, \$213,000; 1964, \$213,000; 1965, \$213,000.

1. *Expenses, sale of timber, etc., on reclamation lands*.—A portion of the receipts from timber sales on public lands set aside for reclamation purposes is used to cover the cost of sales (41 Stat. 202; 53 Stat. 1196).

2. *Leasing of grazing lands*.—State, county, and privately owned grazing lands that are intermingled with public grazing lands are managed on a leased basis within the limits of receipts from such arrangements (43 U.S.C. 315m).

3. *Payments to Oklahoma (royalties)*.—The State of Oklahoma is paid 37½% of the Red River oil and gas royalties in lieu of State and local taxes in Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache tribal funds (42 Stat. 1448), to be used for construction and maintenance of public roads and support of public schools (44 Stat. 740).

4. *Payments to Coos and Douglas Counties, Oreg., from receipts, Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands*.—Out of receipts from the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands in Oregon, payments in lieu of taxes are made to Coos and Douglas Counties for schools, roads, highways, bridges, and port districts (53 Stat. 753-754).

5. *Payments to counties, Oregon and California grant lands*.—Fifty percent of the receipts of Oregon and California land-grant funds is paid the counties in which the lands are situated, to be used as other county funds (39 Stat. 218; 50 Stat. 876).

6. *Payments to States (grazing fees)*.—The States are paid 33½% of the fees from each grazing district on Indian lands ceded to the United States within the State's boundaries (43 U.S.C. 315j).

7. *Payments to States (proceeds of sales)*.—The States are paid 5% of the net proceeds from sale of public land and public land products (31 U.S.C. 711).

8. *Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands outside grazing districts*.—The States are paid 50% of the grazing fee receipts from public domain lands outside grazing districts (43 U.S.C. 315i, 315m).

9. *Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands within grazing districts*.—The States are paid 12½% of grazing fee receipts from grazing district lands within their boundaries (43 U.S.C. 315b, 315i).

10. *Payments to States from grazing receipts, etc., public lands within grazing districts, miscellaneous*.—The States are paid specifically determined amounts from grazing fee receipts from miscellaneous lands within grazing districts when payment is not feasible on a percentage basis (43 U.S.C. 315).

11. *Payments to States from receipts under Mineral Leasing Act*.—Alaska is paid 90% and other States 37½% of the receipts from bonuses, royalties, and rentals resulting from development of mineral resources under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191), and from leases of potash deposits (30 U.S.C. 285), on public lands.

12. *Payments to counties, national grasslands*.—Of the revenues received from the use of submarginal lands, 25% is paid to the counties in which such land is situated, for school and road purposes (7 U.S.C. 1012).

13. *Expenses, Public Land Administration Act*.—Public Law 86-649, approved July 14, 1960, permanently appropriated certain moneys to the Secretary of the Interior. Timber purchasers or permittees provide bond or deposit to assure fulfillment of contracts. Users of roads under jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management may make deposits for maintenance purposes. Moneys received in forfeiture of such bonds or for road

maintenance are available for necessary forest improvement, protection, and rehabilitation, and for road maintenance. Moneys collected on Oregon and California grant lands are available for those lands only and amounts in excess of the cost of doing the work are transferred to miscellaneous receipts (74 Stat. 507-08).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, through the courtesy of the Senator from Washington and his associates on the floor, I have been given a copy of the included portion of the Submerged Lands Act shown in title 43 of the United States Code, the 1964 edition. I do not find the word "quitclaim" in these sections. The word "quitclaim" was used, however, dozens of times in the debate. I find in these sections ample justification for that use. I shall read a portion of two sections.

Subchapter 2 of that title has for its subject "Lands Beneath Navigable Waters Within State Boundaries." Section 1311, is headed "Rights of the States."

(a) CONFIRMATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF TITLE AND OWNERSHIP OF LANDS AND RESOURCES; MANAGEMENT, ADMINISTRATION, LEASING, DEVELOPMENT, AND USE

It is determined and declared to be in the public interest that (1) title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and (2) the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use the said lands and natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are, subject to the provisions hereof—

Here are the meaningful words:

recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof.

(B) RELEASE AND RELINQUISHMENT OF TITLE AND CLAIMS OF UNITED STATES; PAYMENT TO STATES OF MONEYS PAID UNDER LEASES

(1) The United States releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid, except as otherwise reserved herein, all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, improvements, and natural resources; (2) the United States releases and relinquishes all claims of the United States, if any it has, for money or damages arising out of any operations of said States or persons pursuant to State authority upon or within said lands and navigable waters;

I shall not complete the reading of that section.

Section 1313 reads:

EXCEPTIONS FROM CONFIRMATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF STATES' TITLE, POWER AND RIGHTS

There is excepted from the operation of section 1311 of this title—

(a) all tracts or parcels of land together with all accretions thereto, resources therein, or improvements thereon, title to which has been lawfully and expressly acquired by the United States from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the law of the State or of the United States, and all lands which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State;

It is very clear that the land in which the Federal Government claims title, by acquisition and condemnation, and always acquisition under State law, is exempted from this release, and that the Federal Government was simply releasing and confirming to the State the complete right as to whatever the Federal Government had there—it does not use the word "ownership"—to the States.

The word "quitclaim" was used dozens and dozens of times in the course of the debate and appropriately so because of the wording I quoted and other wording.

To the contrary, where the word "title" appears, it made clear the Federal Government reserves to itself all that title where it held title under the laws of the States.

That is the point I wanted to make. I thank the Senator for yielding.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

AMENDMENT OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1401) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall address myself to this subject at greater length tomorrow. I shall outline my reasons for supporting the Ellender amendment and my opposition to the bill as it presently stands.

I wish to make clear as I have indicated already, that I have and I am willing at any time in the future to report any authorization or appropriation for funds for the land and conservation fund that the fund requires, or which is needed to provide parks and recreational facilities, where they are justified. So far as the position of the committee in that regard is concerned, this Senator has no objection and he is willing to support whatever the wisdom of Congress and the Committee on Appropriations thinks proper for that purpose.

However, I very strongly oppose any proposal which is inherent in the act to treat the revenues that are being earned by the citizens of Louisiana, Texas, California, and other States by their hard labor on the Outer Continental Shelf to produce oil and make the area valuable as though that were some pot of gold that someone discovered at the end of the rainbow. Unfortunately, there have been too many ideas from people that oil produced from submerged land in the sea is a vast asset which someone just stumbled across and that funds derived from work there should not be required to be scrutinized studiously to see if Congress is justified in expending for any purpose as should be done in connection with other moneys that flow to the Federal Treasury.

Therefore, Mr. President, if there is to be any dedication, and at this moment I am not proposing any dedication, of the revenue that comes from submerged lands on the Continental Shelf, the logical dedication would be parallel to the Reclamation Act which benefited the States where that land to be reclaimed was located. Precedent there was that the money would be under a State and Federal program: 37.5 percent would be paid to the State directly, 10 percent would go into the administration, and the other 52.5 percent would be used to develop dams, power facilities, irrigation structures, and so forth to make valuable all of that vast land in those areas from which these minerals were being produced.

If one were to pursue the same analogy, I would say there is no greater neglect in the resources of America than there is in connection with water resources. Americans have misused these resources, and abused them. Americans have despoiled what nature has given us to the extent that the water resources of the country are very badly polluted and poorly used. There is great need to overcome the mischief that man has done to the water resources of this country.

Certainly, if one compares the amount of work that is being done with the tremendous job that must be done, there is greater discrepancy in this area than in any other area.

We have a beautiful river in Washington, D.C., between the States of Virginia and Maryland. One could say it is one of our great national assets. The river provides a beautiful scenic view nowadays, but if a child should fall off of a boat into the Potomac River and had to be fished out, the doctor would most likely place the child in an isolation ward to see whether he was going to develop typhoid or hepatitis because the river

has become a cesspool which is a disgrace to any country.

If one were going to take the resources developed beneath the water controlled by the United States, and dedicate them to anything, one of the most logical things for such a dedication would be to overcome the mischief man has done to this resource to the extent it is a horror to be avoided, and it is something of which we cannot be proud but rather something which should cause us to hang our heads in shame.

I walked around the cherry blossoms while the trees were in bloom and I noticed the gorgeous grandeur of that scenic view. It would attract one's attention with its beauty unless one looked at the water beneath. The water was stinking and there were dead fish all over the place. Nothing can live in that water and no one would dare go into it. Yet, it is one of our great natural resources.

What can we do if we want a dedication of the resources that come from beneath the water that covers the land and soil of America? The most logical place would be to repair the mischief already done to them.

The beautiful Chesapeake Bay produces a great many oysters. It could be one of the finest places for swimming and recreation in the entire country. If we want to bring that about, we must do something about pollution on the one hand and sea nettles on the other because one is likely to come out very badly injured by the kind of animal life growing there at the present time.

I tried to swim in the area of Norfolk and had occasion to notice what that area is like and I would say, at the risk of one's life, one could possibly swim in the Norfolk area, in Hampton Roads, and so forth, or nearby, in the Chesapeake Bay area around Ocean View because of pollution.

Those are problems created by man, and man has done very little to overcome and correct them.

Lake Erie is a national cesspool itself, and some of the other Great Lakes, are in about as bad a shape. It represents some of the manmade mischief which should be overcome if we are going to make our water resources what they once were, and what they have a potential to become.

As I have indicated, I shall document and supplement all this with information later. Even when we consider the Outer Continental Shelf, one of the best experts in the world talked about what would happen in developing the resources of the sea, not just off Louisiana, but in other States—Virginia, Maine, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Texas, California, Alaska, and others.

He pointed out that the yield we are getting from the sea today is only about 1 percent of its potential. Thus, if one is to pursue the theory that when we deplete a wasting asset we should put something back so that there will be something of value when we get through with it, the logical pursuit of that argument is that when we take the resources from beneath the sea we should use some of the money needed to do that to de-

velop food potential in the sea, so that when the oil is gone—and it will be gone, insofar as we presently know it to exist, 50 years from now—that there will be other vast wealth and resources of one sort or another which we can use to our advantage and for the advantage of all humanity.

The most logical way would be to develop the resources of the sea, to reclaim areas of no particular value and to put them to good use. If the reclamation States where the Federal Government owns a large domain are entitled to have a reclamation fund in which money is used primarily for the advantage of those States to develop their arid lands, a parallel use would be to develop the tremendous potential of the sea for the good of all humanity. That would claim a priority over buying parks and playgrounds. It would suggest a program to combat the pollution of the sea itself—just the sort of thing that happened on Waikiki Beach today and on the beaches of San Juan, P.R., a short time ago. There are certainly important claims on which those who work the sea to produce its resources could ask for consideration.

By virtue of living near the sea, they are subject to tremendous damage by tropical hurricanes which generate usually in warm water areas but hit the coastline of the United States anywhere from Texas to Maine and do enormous damage. Hurricane Betsy, a year or so ago, did approximately \$1 billion worth of damage in the State of Louisiana alone. The people who must go out and work those resources, or go to work on the Continental Shelf and produce oil from the sea, are entitled to ask not only that the wealth in the area be restored in some fashion as the value is depleted, but also that something be done to make it possible for them to live in those areas so that they can protect themselves from tropical hurricanes.

One should not expect to receive the benefit of the labors of these workers without providing them with something in return. A minimum that could be asked would be to make adequate protection available for their homes and property from tidal waves and hurricanes which strike the coastal areas. That is a very big problem.

Where are we going to find the money? That is one of the questions asked most often when we try to do something to relieve the suffering and the damage caused by hurricanes, tidal waves, or earthquakes. We have to ask for appropriations of money to provide for relief in the most disastrous cases. If someone were to dedicate funds, then those who live and suffer the hazards because they live near the sea have a right to ask that they receive prior consideration, if there is to be such dedication, over someone who merely wants a better park to play in or a larger park, or who would like to see more recreational facilities developed somewhere.

So that it would seem to me there is no case made to show the essential connection of these parks and recreational areas to the Outer Continental Shelf. There is no better case made for creating more recreational advantages by buying more parkland than for cleaning

up our rivers which are no longer usable in a great many areas because of pollution. There are those who have a better claim, by virtue of the fact that they live near areas from which revenue is to be derived and live adjacent to the Continental Shelf, have a right to expect some sort of protection or consideration before the revenue that they are generating should be siphoned off into some other program.

The best immediate answer to the problem we face, as of this moment, is to amend the bill, as suggested by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], to provide an authorization in the amount that the sponsors of the bill seek and solve their problem insofar as funds are needed for the program they would like to have for the future.

After that, I would hope that the coastal States themselves would have the opportunity to meet, consult, suggest, and recommend to Congress a program to help develop the resources of the oceans, the gulf, and the Outer Continental Shelf so that, as a result of developing some resources in the area, other resources might be developed in the future.

This would be a better answer. In any event, I would think that to speak of dedication when there is no essential connection whatever between them, on the theory that this is just some pot of gold someone found at the end of a rainbow, would be a poor answer to the best uses of the resources which can be produced from this area, which are great indeed, and which I hope to discuss later.

DEDICATION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES TO THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND IS ESSENTIAL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have expressed the view that among the most valuable achievements of the 88th, 89th, and 90th sessions of Congress have been those establishing by law a galaxy of beautiful national parks and recreation areas to provide our citizens with welcome retreats. Cape Cod National Seashore in Massachusetts, Fire Island National Seashore in New York, Assateague National Seashore in Maryland, Padre Island National Seashore in Texas, Point Reyes National Seashore in California, Canyonlands in Utah, the Ozark National Scenic Parkway in Missouri, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore in Indiana—are all lasting and wholly admirable contributions to the well-being of the Nation.

It has been my privilege and great honor to support all the measures creating these recreation areas and parklands.

However, although much has been done, much remains to be done to preserve beautiful natural resorts for the enjoyment of the citizenry. We still need the Oregon Dunes National Seashore in Oregon, Sleeping Bear Dunes in Michigan, and of overwhelming importance, the Redwood National Park in California. Many other areas are known to us which should be acquired to provide the people of this country with places to rest and find needed recreation in beautiful surroundings. In my State of Alaska we need the National Parkway in the Chitina Valley. My proposal for it is now

under study by the National Park Service.

It has long been clear that we cannot achieve full development of needed recreation areas—indeed we cannot complete the job so well begun with the areas already set aside unless additional sources of funds are found to acquire land. The Land and Water Conservation Act of the 88th Congress achieved, by its enactment, recognition of the need to earmark Federal revenues for the important purpose of buying land needed for parks. The tools provided by that landmark legislation for selecting and buying the lands we need for parks have been very useful, indeed, and have served the purpose for which they were intended.

It is now clear, though, that other sources of revenue must be found to provide a secure foundation and stability for a program generally approved for purchase of parklands throughout the United States. I extend my hearty congratulations to the eminent chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Senator JACKSON, of Washington, for providing the inspiration for the legislation now before us. By enactment of S. 1401 we would authorize creative utilization of the funds derived from mineral resources of the Outer Continental Shelf to meet a pressing need of the people—the need for recreation areas, becoming increasingly scarce and escalating in value at a rapid rate. Having given repeated recognition to the policy of establishment, by the Federal Government, of park areas for the enjoyment of the people, we must not allow the hope of additional recreational areas to become bitter disappointment when funds are not made available for the necessary purchase of land for the purposes stated.

S. 1401 would make available for purchase of parklands, a limited portion of the revenues of the Outer Continental Shelf now deposited in the Treasury for a period of 5 years, for the fiscal years 1969 through 1973. This is a thoroughly desirable use of these funds, not now otherwise earmarked, and I believe we are entirely right in enacting this legislation.

The Geological Survey has estimated that the Outer Continental Shelf off my State of Alaska covers approximately 580,000 square miles and represents two-thirds of the total U.S. Continental Shelf area. This vast region of the world has been barely explored and we are only dimly aware, as yet, of its mineral potential and economic wealth. It is known to contain large volumes of sedimentary rock that could have potential for oil and gas. Exploration of this treasure is barely beginning but we know the petroleum industry looks toward the Outer Continental Shelf off Alaska as a likely location of important deposits.

This being the case, I feel we should not overlook completely the possibility that one day we might want to authorize a system whereby the States bordering the Outer Continental Shelf might have some share in this wealth. I have considered the proposal of the Senator from Louisiana for a distribution of this wealth to the States on the same basis

as mineral-leasing revenues are distributed to the States where this is a source of wealth. The fact that Alaska is bordered by so large a potential source of wealth leads me to point out that our State may one day find the Outer Continental Shelf revenues to be an essential source of income.

These are aspects of public policy governing the disposition of Outer Continental Shelf revenues which may yet deserve reconsideration.

At this time, however, I strongly support S. 1401 as a measure which will insure use, for a limited time, of a limited portion of these revenues for a very special kind of benefit for all our citizens. I am sure its benefits will be appreciated and enjoyed by many generations of Americans for all time to come.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive D, 90th Congress, second session, the International Coffee Agreement, 1968, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the agreement, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

A year ago this month, I met with the leaders of the American states in Punta del Este, Uruguay. In that historic meeting we reinforced the bonds of friendship that link this Nation with our 230 million neighbors to the South. We pledged to continue and extend hemisphere cooperation.

Today I recommend that the Senate renew and strengthen one of the most important economic agreements of our time—the International Coffee Agreement, which expires in September 1968.

The Coffee Agreement was born in 1962 as a first fulfillment of the Alliance for Progress. More than 60 nations joined together in that Agreement. President John F. Kennedy hailed it as "a heartening example of international cooperation to resolve a vitally important economic problem."

That problem, in its broad dimension, was to stabilize world coffee prices to benefit both the coffee producer and coffee consumer. For years, wide price swings had wasted the resources and hindered the growth of developing nations who depend so heavily on coffee exports.

Coffee is the economic lifeblood of more than 40 developing nations—from plantations to small cooperatives, spanning Latin America, Africa and Asia. Second only to petroleum as a source of foreign exchange for developing countries, coffee exports yielded over \$2.3 billion in 1966. These exports have helped to build

schools, hospitals, factories and roads—the pillars of peace and progress. And they have provided the funds for the growing nations to buy the products of America's farms and industries.

America is a Nation of coffee drinkers. We consume about half the supply of traded coffee. Our coffee industry is the world's largest. We must assure the American consumer all the coffee he wants at fair and reasonable prices.

The 1962 agreement—which the Senate ratified in 1963—has done the job of promoting price stability for coffee consumers and producers alike:

—Coffee import prices have been fair. They are almost 25 percent lower than the average price between 1953 and 1962, and 10 percent higher than during the world coffee slump of 1962.

—The sharp price fluctuations that plagued the world coffee market in past years have been avoided.

—Coffee consumers and roasters have been assured steady supplies at predictable and stable prices.

The 1968 agreement I propose will extend this record of success. It builds on the experience we have gained over the last several years by:

—Assuring that different types of coffee will be available at fair prices to meet changes in consumer tastes and preferences.

—Providing fair treatment in trade for all forms of coffee.

—Attacking the problem of coffee surpluses by production control and by creating a Diversification Fund to encourage shifts to other crops.

Woodrow Wilson once said that "the highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people." Nothing so embodies that philosophy as the International Coffee Agreement. It shows that large industrial nations and small developing nations—guided by the principles of self-help and harmony—can work together for the benefit of all.

That good work has been carried on for the past five years. Through the International Coffee Agreement the machinery of economic cooperation is now in place—tested over the years and now improved.

Without that machinery, we could return to the days of ruinous coffee price swings, disrupting the economies of many friendly nations, impairing world coffee trade, and endangering the continued flow of coffee at reasonable prices to the tables of American families.

I urge the Senate to give this instrument of international cooperation its early and favorable consideration.

The Secretary of State will shortly submit legislation to implement the agreement.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 23, 1968.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate

adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 24, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23, 1968:

IN THE ARMY

The U.S. Army Reserve officer named herein to be Chief of Army Reserve under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3019:

Maj. Gen. William James Sutton, O263659.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. James M. Masters, Sr., U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233, effective from the date of his retirement.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Robert L. Johnson, Traver, Calif., in place of R. K. Weisner, deceased.

HAWAII

Ernest A. Cravalho, Paia, Hawaii, in place of A. F. Cravalho, retired.

IDAHO

Gisela S. Tibbets, Elk River, Idaho, in place of R. E. Payne, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Ralph W. Corrigan, Lorraine, Ill., in place of P. K. Koontz, deceased.

IOWA

Marvin W. Dilly, Ashton, Iowa, in place of B. H. Richter, deceased.

Neil E. Bolin, Clarksville, Iowa, in place of M. L. Neal, resigned.

KANSAS

Waldo L. Cain, Independence, Kans., in place of L. V. Ferrell, retired.

MAINE

David A. Pooler, Corinna, Maine, in place of E. G. Maxim, retired.

Roger J. Lynch, South Berwick, Maine, in place of H. K. Joy, retired.

MARYLAND

Ruth B. Smith, Darlington, Md., in place of E. V. Botts, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Stanley A. Delaronde, Brewster, Mass., in place of R. O. Montgomery, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Charles E. Yaeger, Bloomfield Hills, Mich., in place of H. J. Dyble, resigned.

Edward L. Downey, Jr., Marquette, Mich., in place of J. S. Courtney, retired.

George P. Woodruff, Oden, Mich., in place of M. O. Davis, retired.

MINNESOTA

Theresa I. Lane, Avon, Minn., in place of U. F. Grunloh, deceased.

Annette W. Chapek, Elkton, Minn., in place of Frank Henderson, deceased.

Erwin G. Schluter, Glenwood, Minn., in place of C. K. DesRocher, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Jerome M. Foxworth, Foxworth, Miss., in place of Ida Koen, retired.

NEW JERSEY

John Tarnowsky, Montvale, N.J., in place of Margaret Dualsky, retired.

NEW YORK

Morris Friedman, Long Beach, N.Y., in place of Herman Wood, retired.

Peter J. Ruggiero, Long Island City, N.Y., in place of H. C. Schreiber, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clyde A. Frazier, Claremont, N.C., in place of P. H. Moser, retired.
Herman Stephenson, Princeton, N.C., in place of L. E. Feedin, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

Alice S. Langaas, Forest River, N. Dak., in place of M. E. Graving, deceased.

OHIO

Edolo F. Theodore, Hopedale, Ohio, in place of D. T. Dickerson, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Wilfrid G. Minner, Bally, Pa., in place of G. L. Shuhler, retired.

Lester E. Roth, Nazareth, Pa., in place of L. D. Clewell, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Thomas E. Jackson, Bowling Green, S.C., in place of A. P. Jackson, deceased.

TENNESSEE

Wiley R. Williamson, New Johnsonville, Tenn., in place of B. P. McCauley, deceased.

TEXAS

Michael S. Ball, Elmendorf, Tex., in place of J. E. Ball, retired.

WASHINGTON

Florence M. Presentin, Rockport, Wash., in place of M. A. Presentin, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Martha L. Ferrell, Big Bend, W. Va., in place of Opal Bower, retired.

Morris M. Homan, Franklin, W. Va., in place of Alice McCoy, retired.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 23, 1968:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

W. Marvin Watson, of Texas, to be Postmaster General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, April 23, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am the Lord.—Leviticus 19: 18.

O Thou whose will it is that we do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee—forgive our wayward ways our foolish flings, and our majoring in minors while the world burns around us.

Remove from our national life the spirit of discord and suspicion and ill will. Let our criticism of other people be as kindly as our criticism of ourselves and our relationship to others be as good as our relationship to ourselves, lest bitterness blight our lives and in our hatred we destroy ourselves. Lead us in the paths of unity and peace and accord for Thy name's sake and for the welfare of our country. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 5, 1968:

H.J. Res. 933. Joint resolution to proclaim National Jewish Hospital Save Your Breath Month; and

H.R. 1308. An act to establish the Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site in the State of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

On April 11, 1968:

H.R. 2516. An act to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7325. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exchange certain Federal lands for certain lands owned by Mr. Robert S. Latham, Albany, Oreg.

On April 12, 1968:

H.J. Res. 1223. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period the 7-percent excise tax rate on automobiles and the 10-percent excise tax rate on communication services;

H.J. Res. 1229. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10599. An act relating to the Tiwa Indians of Texas; and

H.R. 11254. An act for the relief of Jack L. Good.

On April 19, 1968:

H.R. 5799. An act to amend the District of Columbia Uniform Gifts to Minors Act to provide that gifts to minors made under such act may be deposited in savings and loan associations and related institutions, and for other purposes;

H.R. 16324. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11816. An act to provide compensation for law enforcement officers not employed by the United States killed or injured while apprehending persons suspected of committing Federal crime, and for other purposes.

On April 22, 1968:

H.R. 13042. An act to amend the act of June 20, 1906, and the District of Columbia election law to provide for the election of members of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14940. An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14940) entitled "An act to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 15399, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 15399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the further conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, NATCHER, FLOOD, BOW, JONAS, and LAIRD.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 655 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 655

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress to recognize and acknowledge the world significance of the Warsaw ghetto uprising as a reaffirmation of the ineradicable determination to fight for freedom from oppression and that Congress joins in commemorating on April 25 the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising against the Nazi occupation forces by the beleaguered and outnumbered Jews of the Warsaw ghetto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was that the reading of the complete resolution?

The SPEAKER. The resolution has been completely read.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE WARSAW GHETTO

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to